# FINNISCH-UGRISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

# Inhalt

# Band 67

# Besprechungen

# Berichte und Nekrologe

*Hans-Hermann Bartens*
Göttingen

# Der Kuckuck in den Glaubensvorstellungen der Saamen

The desire to be able to look into the future and thus be prepared for what it holds, can be achieved, according to folk beliefs, by observing animals, including birds. The Saami materials scrutinized for this work mention approximately sixty different bird species which have some kind of function as an omen. The most important among them is the cuckoo, both as far as the number of mentions is concerned as well as its diffusion throughout the Saami area, which, however, does not appear to extend to the easternmost traditional areas. This observation also applies to the other bird species. As birds also hold this function in Scandinavian and Finnish tradition, the postulate that we are dealing with a shared tradition seems justified. A systematic comparison of the distinct traditions is not the aim of this paper. Nevertheless, the comparisons made reveal common features among which, however, aspects specific to the Saami area can be discerned.

The cuckoo has traditionally been one of the most feared birds. Its relationship with humans was mostly unidirectional: the cuckoo is in command while man is exposed to the magical powers of the bird. Folklore holds information on how to undo this harmful influence; in addition to warnings, there are concrete recommendations on how to counter it. There are also tales of humans simply being exposed to such influence. The harm done usually affected daily chores, but especially in the northern Saami region it could impact on a person's very life. Nonetheless, there are also examples of a positive relationship between bird and man such as the cuckoo's tree. In this specific tradition, the cuckoo is again in charge, but there is genuine interaction between man and the animal.

## 1. Vögel als Omentiere

Beim Wunsch, etwas über das Zukünftige zu erfahren, spielen Beobachtungen in der Natur eine wichtige Rolle. Omina sind u. a. aus der Tier- und Pflanzenwelt zu entnehmen, und unter den Tieren spielen die Vögel eine große Rolle: Rund 60 Arten von ihnen dienen den Saamen für verschiedenste Voraussagen. Unter den Vögeln gibt es einige, die nur mythisch sind; von ihnen liegen Nachrichten insbesondere aus dem lulesaamischen Gebiet vor, doch auch von den Umesaamen gibt es mehrere entsprechende Aufzeichnungen. Eine einzelne Nachricht, aufgezeichnet in den Jahren um 1905, stammt aus dem åselesaamischen Gebiet, aus dem Saamendorf Vapsten, in der ein persönliches Erlebnis wiedergegeben ist. Sie handelt von *gåatal*, einem geheimnisvollen Vogel, den niemand gesehen oder gefangen hat, den man aber in der Nacht fliegen hören kann, wobei es sich dann anhört, als ob ein Mensch klagte. Als Spukvogel kündet er einen Tod an (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 108). Die ganz überwiegende Zahl der Omenvögel ist jedoch real und ein Teil der natürlichen Lebenswelt der Saamen. Sie sind ganz unterschiedlicher Größe. Diese reicht von kleinen Vögeln wie der Weidenmeise oder dem Birkenzeisig bis zum Seeadler. Und unterschiedlich groß ist auch die Bandbreite dessen, was man durch die Vögel ersehen kann. Es gibt unter ihnen „Glücksvögel", d.h. Vögel, die Glück bringen, wie auch – mehrheitlich – „Unglücksvögel", d.h. Vögel, deren optische oder akustische Wahrnehmung oder Verhalten ein Unglück voraussagt. Bei einigen Vögeln kann die positive oder negative Wirkung regional wechseln, wie schon Brännström (1929: 160–161) für

die schwedische Tradition gezeigt hat. Das gilt im Lauf der Zeit auch im Saamischen (ebd. 158–159). Die genannte Stelle betrifft den Unglückshäher (nordsaam. *guovssat*), zu dem es in Araksuolo in Arvidsjaur hinsichtlich Glück und Unglück auch synchron gegensätzliche Auffassungen gibt (Brännström 2017: 82). Nach Mitteilung einer anderen Gewährsperson aus Arvidsjaur, einem Waldsaamen aus Brännudden, hängt Glück oder Unglück davon ab, ob sich der Vogel von vorn oder von hinten nähert (Brännström 2017: 94–95, von 1931).[1] Die sehr positive Rolle, die Turi (1992: 162; 2010: 120) dem Unglückshäher zuspricht, gilt mithin nicht allerorten, auch wenn T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 370, Fußnote 2) angibt, der Glaube, dass der Unglückshäher ein Glücksvogel sei, gelte überall in Lappland, und „sogar auch bei den Finnen".[2] Turi (2010: 120; vgl. 1992: 162) nennt sie *Ipmila eŋelat* 'Engel Gottes' und mit drei anderen Vogelarten – Rabe (nordsaam. *garjá*), Schneehühnern (*rievssat*) und Zaubersperling (*cizáš*) – „Kameraden der Lappen-*Sida*" (Turi 1992: 163; vgl. 2010: 120: *Dat atnet guoibmin sámi siidda*).

Die Menge der für die einzelnen Vögel vorliegenden Daten ist sehr unterschiedlich, auch die Zeitspanne, für die sich solche Daten finden. Der erwähnte Seeadler wird nur in einer Quelle aus der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts erwähnt. Jacob Fellman, von 1820 bis 1831 Pfarrer in Utsjoki und als solcher auch für Inari zuständig, gibt an, dass es für die Skoltsaamen ein gutes Zeichen war, einen Seeadler zu sehen, bevor man sich auf den Weg machte, d. h. zum Fischfang aufbrach (Fellman 1906 I: 582; T. I. Itkonen 1946: 244). Dieses Beispiel zeigt einen Zusammenhang zwischen dem Tier, hier dem geschickten Fischfänger, und der Lebenserwerbsform oder beabsichtigten Tätigkeit. Dem Fischfang gingen die Skoltsaamen besonders im Sommer nach.

Im einschlägigen Material zu den Omenvögeln ist der Kuckuck am stärksten vertreten; er nimmt damit auch in der saamischen Tradition eine prominente Stellung ein, wie sie ihm auch in anderen Traditionen

---

1.  Nach einem weiteren (umesaamischsprachigen) Informanten aus Arvidsjaur (Mausjaur) waren die in Vielzahl auftauchenden Unglückshäher als Fleischdiebe unbeliebt (Brännström 2017: 200). – Auch Grundström (1942: 21) führt den Unglückshäher im Verein mit Raufußkauz, Uhu, Lapplandmeise und Sterntaucher für die lulesaamische Tradition als Todesboten auf.

2.  Zu den unterschiedlichen Auffassungen zum Unglückshäher in Finnland vgl. Ojanen (Ojanen & Ulv 2015: 82): Er ist Glücksbringer in Lappland und Kainuu, vor allem Unglücksbringer weiter südlich.

zuerkannt wird: C.-H. Tillhagen leitet den Abschnitt „Göken" (Der Kuckuck) in seinem Werk *Fåglarna i folktron* (1978: 157–177, hier 157) mit der Feststellung ein, dass ihn praktisch bei allen Völkern der alten Welt die ungewöhnliche Stimme und die eigenartigen Lebensgewohnheiten zu einem stärker beachteten Vogel als vielleicht irgendein anderer gemacht hätten. Für die Saamen war der Kuckuck vor allem gefährlich. Die Liste der Vögel, die die Menschen in Lappland einst für die gefährlichsten hielten, variiert etwas, der Kuckuck ist aber immer dabei: Für die östliche Finnmark (Nesseby und Polmak) werden von Qvigstad und Sandberg (1887: 113) Kuckuck, Sterntaucher, Schneeammer, Regenbrachvogel und Bekassine genannt; diese Vögel werden in gleicher Reihenfolge auch von Amund Helland (1906: 307) aufgeführt, der offenbar auf Qvigstad und Sandberg zurückgegriffen hat.[3] Drake (1918: 265) führt aus den Aufzeichnungen von Jonas A. Nensén (1. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts) für Dorotea in der schwedischen Åsele-Lappmark an, die Saamen fürchteten sich am meisten vor Bekassine, Sterntaucher, Krähe und Kuckuck. Der Kuckuck gehört aber bei aller Gefährlichkeit auch zu den Vögeln, deren negative Wirkung nach saamischer Auffassung durch bestimmte Maßnahmen abwehrbar ist.

Als prominenter Vogel ist der Kuckuck für sich oder im Verein mit anderen Vögeln Gegenstand einer reichen Literatur. Bereits der Artikel „Kuckuck" im ursprünglich 1933 erschienenen Band 5 des Handwörterbuchs des deutschen Aberglaubens (HdA 5: 689–751) enthält eine gewaltige Menge an Literaturhinweisen, darunter auch solche zu Skandinavien. Was die saamischen Vorstellungen anbelangt, greift erstmalig K. B. Wiklund (1906) das Thema in einem kurzen Artikel auf, indem er einschlägige, seinerzeit noch unpublizierte Nachrichten von Nensén sowie von anderen Autoren wiedergibt. Kustaa Vilkuna veröffentlichte dann 1929 einen Artikel, der sich hinsichtlich des Saamischen ebenfalls auf Nensén, inzwischen von Drake (1918) veröffentlicht, stützte. Dieser Artikel ist für die Untersuchung der ostseefinnischen Traditionen richtungsweisend gewesen. Welche Ergebnisse diese hervorbrachte und wie diese gedeutet wurden, ist, mit ausführlichen Zitaten, bei Jouko Hautala (1957) zu lesen, der in seinem Artikel die bislang auf die Zugvögel beschränkte Perspektive erweitern wollte. Auf all dies soll hier nicht näher eingegangen werden,

---

3. T. I. Itkonen (1946: 240, Fußnote), der auf Helland verweist, lässt von diesen den Regenbrachvogel ungenannt.

einerseits, weil eine neuerliche Zusammenfassung unnötig Platz in An-
spruch nehmen würde, andererseits aber auch, weil es hier nur – von
gelegentlichen Hinweisen abgesehen – um einen, wenn auch besonders
markanten Vertreter der Zugvögel geht. Hingewiesen sei hier nur noch
auf das soeben erwähnte Werk von Carl-Herman Tillhagen, der 1978, die
gesamte Folklore umfassend, alle wilden Vögel behandelt hat. Wie Åsa
Nyman (1953) hat auch er neben umfangreicher Literatur Archivmateria-
lien ausgewertet. Schwerpunkt ist die schwedische (inklusive finnland-
schwedische) und norwegische Tradition, doch hat er es für richtig erach-
tet, die internationale Folklore zu den Vögeln zu Wort kommen zu lassen
(14–15). Was den Kuckuck anbelangt, hat er sich angesichts der außeror-
dentlichen Menge an Volksdichtung und Volksglauben auf eine Auswahl
beschränken müssen (157). Auf diese 357 Seiten umfassende Abhandlung
wird hier wiederholt verwiesen. Später hat u. a. noch Ingvar Svanberg ein
Buch (2016) zu den Vögeln in der schwedischen Volksüberlieferung publi-
ziert, das auch die saamische Überlieferung berücksichtigt. Bei Lars Ham-
marin (1987, 1990) ist Auskunft über die Vorstellungen in Härjedalen und
Jämtland zu finden.

Im Folgenden sollen vor allem detailliert die Glaubensvorstellungen
beschrieben werden, die die saamischen Gemeinschaften hatten und ha-
ben. Eingeflochten werden Hinweise auf Übereinstimmungen mit den
Nachbarkulturen, ohne dass diese systematisch aufgezeigt werden sollen.
Auch Deutungen von Erscheinungen werden vorgenommen, die Dis-
kussion, die in der soeben angeführten Literatur über den „Vogelbetrug"
geführt wird, wird jedoch nicht erneut näher aufgegriffen. Erfasst wird
aufgrund der Quellenlage ein Zeitraum von etwa zweihundert Jahren. Im
Abschnitt 2 findet sich zunächst Allgemeines zum Kuckuck, zu seinem
Ursprung, seiner magischen Macht und dazu, um welche Zeit des Jahres
der Vogel seinen Ruf ertönen lässt und dadurch wirken kann, bevor dann
in den folgenden Abschnitten das Verhältnis des Vogels zum Menschen in
den Mittelpunkt rückt. Im 3. Abschnitt wird geschildert, wie, unter wel-
chen Umständen vom Kuckuck eine Gefahr für den Menschen ausgeht (3.1)
und welcher Art und welchen Ausmaßes die Gefahr für den Menschen
als Lebewesen selbst oder für seine Tätigkeit sein kann (3.2). Ist hier das
Verhalten des Menschen selbst ausschlaggebend, handelt Abschnitt 4 vom
Verhalten des Vogels, das Gefahr in sich birgt. Abschnitt 5 nennt dann
die Maßnahmen, die gegen einen Schaden (nach 3) ergriffen werden kön-
nen, sei es als Prävention (5.1) oder als nachträgliche Abwehr (5.2). Keinen

Einfluss hingegen hat der Mensch auf sein Schicksal, das ihm durch die Farbe der Füße des Kuckucks vorhergesagt wird (Abschnitt 6). Der folgende Abschnitt 7 zeigt den Kuckuck als Propheten, der die Länge des Lebens vorhersagt. Ist die Vorhersage im Prinzip neutral, zeigt sich der Vogel von seiner positiven Seite, wenn er Wünsche erfüllt (8). Positives unterschiedlicher Art ist auch unter 9 vereint. Die Angaben zum Kuckuck als Wetterpropheten (10) stehen dann vor den Schlussbetrachtungen (11).

## 2. Allgemeines zum Kuckuck

Zum Ursprung des Kuckucks[4] hat ein Lulesaame aus dem Saamendorf Sirkas in Jokkmokk Grundström folgende „alte Sage" erzählt:

> Es war einmal eine alte Frau, die Schwiegermutter war, und eine junge Frau des Sohnes, aber die Schwiegertochter war böse auf die Schwiegermutter. Sie gab ihr weder zu essen noch zu trinken. Da wurde die Alte wegen des Durstes ein Kuckuck. Sie flog durch das Rauchloch hinauf und begann zu kuckucken. Und zwei kleine Vögel folgten ihr. (Grundström 1923: 53.[5])

Ganz anders ist die Entstehung des Kuckucks nach einer anderen Mitteilung aus dem Saamendorf Sirkas: Danach entsteht er aus einem *riphök* ("Schneehuhnhabicht") – und wäre demnach also eigentlich kein Zugvogel, der im Frühling aus dem Süden kommt. „Der Habicht verwandelt sich in einen Kuckuck und bekommt dann eine andere Stimme, so dass er ‚kuku!' rufen kann. Wenn der Birkensaft zu fließen beginnt, dann weitet sich die Kehle des Kuckucks und er beginnt zu rufen." (Grundström 1923: 48.) Dieses spiegelt auf eigene Weise eine in der schwedischen Tradition mehrfach belegte, schon aus der Antike bekannte Auffassung von der Metamorphose wider, nach der allerdings der Kuckuck zu einem Habicht wird (Tillhagen 1978: 174; Svanberg 2016: 58).

Von den Inarisaamen wird vermeldet (T.I. Itkonen 1946: 241), sie glaubten, der bis in den Norden Finnlands als Sommervogel vorkommende Wendehals (*Jynx torquilla*) sei das Weibchen des Kuckucks. Die Beziehung von Kuckuck und Wendehals kommt im Nordsaamischen sprachlich

---

4. Nordsaam. *giehka*, inarisaam. *kiehâ*, skoltsaam. *ǩiõkk*, lulesaam. *giehka*, pitesaam. *gehka*, umesaam. *giähka*, südsaam. *gïeke*.
5. Vgl. Qvigstads (1925: 38) häufiger belegten Ursprungssagentyp 50: *Die Verwandlung der Hausfrau in einen Schwarzspecht.*

dadurch zum Ausdruck, dass Kuckuck (in Genitivform) erstes Glied in den verschiedenen den Vogel benennenden Komposita ist: *giegabađuš*, *giegabahtasihkku*, *giegabiigá* oder *giegacizáš* (Sammallahti & Nickel 2006: 296). Diese Benennungen weisen aber den Wendehals als Begleiter des Kuckucks aus: *bahtasihkku* „bottom-wiper" (Nielsen 1932–1962 I: 148), *bađuš* 'Schwanz (des Vogels)', *biigá* 'Magd', *cizáš* 'Vögelchen' (Sammallahti & Nickel 2006: 39, 79, 121).[6] Der Wendehals selbst ist Verfasser nicht als Omentier begegnet.[7]

Der Ruf des Kuckucks ist weit zu hören. Jonas A. Nensén hat in Dorotea, wo er 1832 eine Pfarrstelle antrat, notiert, der Kuckuck sei Pfarrer, der einen kleinen Vogel im Gefolge habe, seinen Hilfspfarrer[8], die anderen Vögel seien die Gemeinde (Drake 1918: 345). Auch nach der Auffassung der Skoltsaamen ist der Kuckuck „Pfarrer des Waldes", wie Samuli Paulaharju (1921: 153) mitteilt[9], der zugleich angibt, dass der Kuckuck nach deren Auffassung derjenige Vogel sei, der Gott am nächsten sei (Paulaharju 1921: 153; Storå 1971: 204). Er gehört, so Turi (1992: 160; nach deutscher Übersetzung), zu den Vögeln, „die das Kommende verkünden". Im Original ist die Rede von einem Zaubervogel, saam. *diidaloddi* oder *noaideloddi* (Turi 2010: 118).[10] Seine besondere Kraft bleibt über seinen Tod

---

6. Vgl. die finnische Benennung für den Wendehals, *käenpiika* „Kuckucksmagd" (folkloristische Belege Järvinen 2005: 82–84). Im Schwedischen besteht durch die Benennung für den Wendehals, *göktyta*, zwar auch eine Verbindung zum Kuckuck, doch nur für Schwedisch-Finnland wird der Vogel als Knecht oder Magd des Kuckucks (*gökdräng*, *gökpiga*, *kuckupia*) genannt (Tillhagen 1978: 155), für Schweden selbst wird einzig auf die Bedeutung des Vogels für die Aussaat verwiesen, was sich auch in Benennungen wie *sågök* „Säkuckuck" (Härjedalen) oder *såsparv* „Säsperling" (Jämtland) niederschlägt (Svanberg 2016: 59–60).

7. Für die finnische Tradition führt Hautala (1957: 25) den Wendehals aber unter den Betrugsvögeln an.

8. Vgl. die soeben genannte Vorstellung vom Wendehals als Begleiter.

9. T. I. Itkonen (1946: 239), der Paulaharju wiedergibt, weist in diesem Zusammenhang (Fußnote 3) auf Matti Varonens (1891: 198) Mitteilung aus Ilomantsi (Karelien) hin, nach der der Kuckuck auch dort Pfarrer der Vögel ist.

10. So auch im nordfinnischen Utsjoki (T. Itkonen 1971: 36, Aufzeichnung von 1955), was auch eine Gewährsperson aus Talvadas in Utsjoki referiert, die zugleich erklärt, nicht daran zu glauben (TKU 67/287). Eine andere aus Karasjok sieht das aber bestätigt (TKU 66/68). Aus Nesseby ist *noaiddes loddi* 'id.' belegt (Qvigstad 1920: 110, Nr. 369a). Nach einem Informanten aus dem lulesaamischen Jokkmokk (Sirkas) ist der Kuckuck ein „heiliger Vogel"

hinaus wirksam, weil er sich rächen kann: Ein 1844 geborener Rentier-saame aus dem åselesaamischen Vilhelmina erzählte vom tödlichen Schuss eines Burschen auf einen Kuckuck. Als sich sein Ren später er-drosselt hatte, war es klar, dass der Vogel sich gerächt und Unglück über seinen Mörder gebracht hatte (Tomasson 1988: 47, aufgezeichnet 1917). Bei Leem (1767: 505), der die Verhältnisse von Porsanger an der finnmärki-schen Küste beschreibt, heißt es, man halte den für unglücklich, der ei-nen Kuckuck geschossen hat (*Cuculum vero figere res erat infausti ominis plena*). Einen Kuckuck zu schießen ist nach einer viel jüngeren Aufzeich-nung aus Talvadas in Utsjoki unmöglich, er stirbt nicht (TKU 67/53). Es zu versuchen, bleibt nicht ohne Folgen. Der Vogel zeigt nach einer 1888 im Varangergebiet aufgezeichneten und „Spuk im Wald" betitelten Erzäh-lung seine Macht, indem er in einem Frühling das Gewehr des Mannes verzaubert, so dass sich der Schuss auch nach mehrmaligen Versuchen nicht löst. Der Kuckuck ruft weiter. Den sonst furchtlosen Mann über-kommt schreckliche Angst, auch sein Hund verhält sich unsinnig. Als er dann über einen Fluss geht, wird er wieder er selbst. Hier erhält der Kuckuck Züge eines übernatürlichen Wesens, der Mann wird, ohne dass das Verb hier verwendet wird, *ráimmahallat*, was ausdrückt, dass der Be-troffene in einen Zustand des Erschreckens verfällt, der auch hier zur Ver-wirrung führt und der auf die Begegnung mit Jenseitigen weist. Auch den Hund erfasst das. Das Überqueren eines Gewässers bringt die Rettung. (Qvigstad 1927: 288–291.) Die Verbindung von Kuckuck und Jenseitigem ergibt sich u. a. daraus, dass er den Tod vorhersagen kann, wie im Fol-genden gezeigt wird.[11] – In einer anderen Aufnahme aus Talvadas kann der Schütze, der in einem Frühjahr erproben will, ob der Kuckuck ein Zaubervogel ist und ihn eine Kugel trifft, den Vogel jedoch töten. Als aber seine drei guten Angelgeräte zerbrechen und verlorengehen, schreibt er dies doch dem Schuss auf den Kuckuck zu (TKU 67/131). Letzteres zeigt

---

(*basselådde*). Den Kuckuck habe man früher verehrt (*man dyrkade [pasotin] fordom göken*; Grundström 1929: 72, von dort auch Fjellström 1986: 404).

Bei den Angaben zu TKU gibt die erste Zahl das Jahr an, in dem die Ton-aufnahme gemacht worden ist, die zweite die Nummer des Tonbandes aus dem betreffenden Jahr.

11. Ohne negative Folgen bleibt der Abschuss nach einer Mitteilung aus Uts-joki (T. I. Itkonen 1946: 239); hier wehrt der Schütze die Gefahr seitens des Kuckucks, den sicheren Tod, durch Abschuss ab.

die fortwährende Gültigkeit der Auffassung, dass der Mensch dem Vogel nicht schaden kann, ohne selbst Schaden zu nehmen. Doch für diese Auffassung gibt es nur wenige Belege. Gewöhnlich ist, wie sich insbesondere durch die nachfolgenden Vogelbetrug-Beispiele zeigen lässt, die Gefährdung eindimensional: Der Mensch ist der magischen Kraft des Vogels ausgesetzt, nicht der Vogel der Kraft des Menschen. Diese Kraft bewirkt auch, dass man zu stottern beginnt, wenn man den Vogel nachäfft; man soll, wie es bei Helland (1906: 306) heißt, deshalb keine Vögel nachäffen, besonders nicht Sterntaucher, Kuckuck und Eisente. Das sei, wie Helland hinzufügt, auch norwegischer Volksglaube.

Der Kuckuck ist im Jahreslauf nicht der erste Vogel, vor dessen Ruf man sich hüten muss: Nensén hat in Kvikkjokk in der Lule-Lappmark notiert (Drake 1918: 265), dass um den 1. Mai herum besonders die Wildgans schreien solle, in der Eriks-Woche – Tag des Hl. Erik ist der 18. Mai – drecke der Sterntaucher und unmittelbar anschließend, vom 21.–27. Mai, müsse man sich vor dem Kuckuck hüten. Ein Saame aus dem südsaamischen Tännäs (Härjedalen) sagte – zeitlich entsprechend – Ella Odstedt, der Kuckuck komme an einem bestimmten Tag, am 25. Mai, in einem schöneren Frühling eine Woche früher (ULMA 20227: 39). Der 25. Mai ist auch in Vilhelmina in der Åsele-Lappmark der „Tag des Kuckucks" (Tomasson 1988: 44, von 1917), und im Südsaamisch-Norwegischen Wörterbuch (Bergsland & Magga 2007: 100) gibt es den Eintrag *gïeken-biejjie* 'der Tag, an dem der Kuckuck zu rufen beginnt (25. Mai)'. Grundström (1950: 48) gibt an, dass in der Lule-Lappmark in der Einteilung des Jahres in acht Jahreszeiten der Frühling die Zeit von Ende April bis um Urbanus, den 25. Mai, umfasst. Die Runenkalender haben den Kuckuck als „Sommerboten" zwar schon als Symbol für den 1. Mai, welcher Tag seit alters *göksmässan* ('Kuckucksmesse') genannt wird (Grundström 1950: 56; Harva 1937: 75), doch für die Lule-Lappmark, so Grundström (a. a. O.), passt das nicht, da der Kuckuck nicht vor etwa dem 25. Mai zu hören ist.[12]

---

12. Tillhagen (1978: 161) vermerkt: „In den altnordischen Kalendern wurde die Zeit zwischen dem 22. April und dem 21. Mai Kuckucksmonat genannt". Einen „Kuckucksmonat" führt Grundström (1950: 52) unter den traditionellen, allerdings der „normalen" kalendarischen Einteilung folgenden Benennungen für die Monate nicht an; er nennt als Vogelnamen enthaltende Monate „*(sj)njuktja-mānnō*" oder „*(sj)njuvhtja-mānnō*" ('Schwanenmonat') für März und „*vuoratjis-mānnō*" ('Krähenmonat') für April. Schriftsprachliche Wörterbücher haben *sjnjuktjamánno*, *njuktjamánno* (Spiik 1994 s. v. *mars*),

Der Kuckuck ist von den für Kvikkjokk genannten Vögeln der letzte, der zurückkommt. Dass der Kuckuck wiederum zu rufen aufhört, ist in der Åsele-Lappmark damit in Verbindung gebracht worden, dass der Saft nicht mehr vom Baum läuft (*när trädet upphör att löpa*) (Drake 1918: 345, Nensén). Die Angabe aus dem lulesaamischen Jokkmokk (Sirkas), dass sich die Kehle des Kuckucks weite, wenn der Birkensaft zu fließen beginnt, und er zu rufen beginnt (wie oben bereits angeführt), er aber nicht länger zu rufen vermag, wenn der Saft nicht mehr vom Baum rinnt, zeigt die enge Verbindung gerade mit der Birke. Wenn es kalt wird, wird seine Kehle eng und er kann keinen Laut mehr von sich geben (Grundström 1923: 48). Nach inarisaamischer Auffassung endet der Kuckucksruf, wenn die Moltebeeren reif geworden sind, da die Beere ihm in der Kehle stecken bleibe (Koskimies & Itkonen 1978: 412–413, aufgezeichnet 1886). Es ist hier also das natürliche Wachstum, an dem das Verstummen des Rufes festgemacht wird. In der bäuerlichen Gemeinschaft ist es hingegen eine Tätigkeit des Menschen, die Heuernte, die den Kuckuck verstummen lässt. Tillhagen (1978: 162–163) führt für Schweden als allgemeine Vorstellung an, dass der Kuckuck zu rufen aufhört, wenn er den ersten Heuhaufen sieht. Dazu stimmt die Notiz von Ella Odstedt von 1942 aus Gautsträsk (Sorsele): „Wenn man zu mähen (*slå*) beginnt, dann schlägt (*slå*) man auf irgendeine Weise ihm die Laute ab, dann wird er stumm (*tunglös*).“ „Wenn man einen frischen Heureuter aufstellt, dann wird er leise.“ (ULMA 18704: 151.)[13]

---

*snjuktjamánno* (Kintel 2012), *vuoratjismánno* (Kintel 2012; Spiik hat keinen Eintrag für April). Auch die südlicheren saamischen Sprachen haben eine entsprechende Benennung für den März: pitesaam. *njuktjamánno* (Wilbur 2016 s. v.), umesaam. *njukttjamánnuo* (Barruk 2021 s. v.). Magga (2009) gibt für März s. v. *mars njoktje* „Schwan(enmonat)“ und für das südliche Südsaam. *voerhtjen-aske* „Krähenmonat“. Bergsland und Magga (2007 s. v.) führen für *voerhtjen-aske* als Bedeutung ‘April; März’ an. Bemerkenswert in diesem Zusammenhang ist, dass der als Omentier eine viel stärkere Rolle als der Schwan spielende Kuckuck im Saamischen offenbar kein Namengeber für einen Monat ist.

13. Belege aus Finnland für den Zusammenhang zwischen Heuernte und Verstummen des Kuckucks finden sich bei Järvinen (2005: 84–86), die aber auch andere Erklärungen für das Verstummen bringt.

## 3. Der sog. Vogelbetrug

### 3.1. Voraussetzung für die Gefahr seitens des Kuckucks

Der Ruf des Kuckucks ist gefährlich, wenn man ihn auf nüchternen Magen hört. Es ist die in Europa (und auch darüber hinaus) verbreitete Vorstellung, für die man besonders in einschlägigen deutschsprachigen Werken zur ostseefinnischen Folklore die Bezeichnung „Vogelbetrug" verwendet hat. Im Saamischen wird man vom Kuckuck beschissen, z. B. nordsaam. *baikkáhallat gihkii*, inarisaam. *pašketittiđ kiehân*; Wiklund (1906: 250) führt für das lulesaamische Gällivare aus seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen „*kiehkai paihkāhtallat* (vom kuckuck beschissen werden)" an.[14] Sammallahti und Nickel (2006: 296) haben auch – beschönigend – *luhččehallat*

---

14. Vgl. finn. *käki paskansi minun* (daneben *käki hieroi minun*; *hieroa* 'reiben, scheuern' kann auch die Bedeutung 'verwirren; beschmutzen' haben (Vilkuna 1929: 113)). Im Saamischen ist die Konstruktion jedoch passivisch und das Agens steht wie üblich im Illativ. Lindahl und Öhrling (1780: 112; 2015: 226) haben s. v. *lådde* Lokativ: „*låddist paikatallet*, på svenska: dåras av fåglar". Im Schwedischen finden sich die Termini *skiten* 'beschissen', *dårad* 'betört, bezaubert' und *gäckad* 'genarrt, betrogen'. Åsa Nyman bringt in ihrem Artikel (1953: 29) eine Karte, aus der die Verbreitung der Termini zu ersehen ist. Für *skiten* finden sich Belege u. a. aus Nordschweden. Nyman (1953: 27) meint, ihre Karte erwecke den Eindruck, dass man mit zwei Hauptgebieten rechnen könne, einem nördlich-östlichen mit Ausdrücken wie *gökskiten* und einem westlich-südlichen mit *dårad*, *gäckad*. „Das könnte mit anderen Worten eine Aufteilung einerseits in ein Gebiet sein, wo die unmittelbare Berührung mit Vogeldreck das Unglücksbringende ist, und anderseits ein Gebiet, wo die Vorstellung mehr psychisch bedingt ist". Wenn Grundström (1923: 48–49) zu seiner Aufzeichnung aus dem lulesaamischen Saamendorf Sirkas (Jokkmokk): „Wenn man am Morgen es nicht schafft, Speise in den Mund zu tun, bevor man den Kuckuck oder die Bekassine hört, widerfährt einem Böses" als Erklärung zu Letzterem anmerkt: „Eigentlich: »so wird man vom Dreck des Vogels getroffen«, was Unglück für den bedeutet, der davon getroffen wird", kommt hierdurch die reale Gefahr, von den Exkrementen des Vogels getroffen zu werden, zum Ausdruck. Entsprechendes hat Grundström auch an anderer Stelle (1929: 72) von demselben Informanten mitgeteilt. Hammarin (1990: 43–44) stellt zwar in seiner Darstellung des Vogelglaubens in Jämtland fest, dass der Ausdruck „beschissen" (*skiten*) in übertragener Bedeutung verwendet werde: „Es gab keine Furcht, vom Vogeldreck beschmutzt zu werden." Doch kann es außer lokalen Unterschieden auch zeitlich bedingte geben. Vom Kuckuck abgesehen besteht Todesgefahr beim Adler: T. I. Itkonen (1946: 244; 1948 II: 371) gibt von den Rentiersaamen in Inari an, dass man einen fliegenden Adler

*gihkii* (*luhččehallat* ist Passivableitung von *luhččet* 'Durchfall haben', wie *baikkáhallat* zu *baikit* 'scheißen'[15]).

Auch wenn es z.B. aus dem Pitesaamischen von seiten Kolmodins Informanten aus Jäckvik in Arjeplog nur kurz heißt (Kolmodin 1914: 7, Nr. 48): „Man darf den Kuckuck nicht hören, bevor man am Morgen etwas gegessen hat", so ist doch der erste Ruf im Frühling gemeint, beim Kuckuck wie bei anderen Vögeln. Ausdrücklich gesagt wird das in einer Mitteilung aus Nesseby (Qvigstad 1920: 111, Nr. 369c, aufgezeichnet in den Jahren 1890–1895): „Wenn jemand im Frühjahr morgens hinausgeht ohne etwas gegessen zu haben und die Vögel des Sommers zum ersten Mal hört, wird er von ihnen betrogen (eig. beschissen)" (für Letzteres im saam. Original *baikatallam*). Ebenfalls aus der Pite-Lappmark, wenn auch von einem Umesaamen aus Arvidsjaur, hat Brännström (2017: 200) 1931 notiert: „Wenn der Kuckuck oder die Krähe im Frühling kommt, soll man immer Speise haben und am Morgen in den Mund stecken, sonst geriet man ins Unglück." Entsprechendes gilt etwa für Vapsten im Åselegebiet: „Man soll sich davor hüten, vom Kuckuck *baikatellem*, vollgedreckt, zu werden. Das geschieht, wenn man den Kuckuck zum ersten Mal auf nüchternen Magen hört." Die von Bäckman und Kjellström (hier 1979: 107) publizierten Aufzeichnungen schildern Verhältnisse und Auffassungen aus dem 19. Jahrhundert, in die auch die Ausführungen von Lars Levi Laestadius fallen, der in seinen zwischen 1840 und 1845 entstandenen „Fragmenten" schreibt (2011: 104, § 78[16]): „Viele Lappen glauben weiterhin, dass die Laute bestimmter Frühlingsvögel Unglück vorhersagen. Deshalb halten sie es für unvermeidlich, nicht mit leerem Magen hinauszugehen." Auch bei Tomasson (1988: 46, Aufzeichnung von 1917) heißt es für Vilhelmina in der Åsele-Lappmark, man solle, um nicht vom Kuckuck beschissen zu werden, achtsam sein und einen Bissen Speise am Morgen, bevor man den Kuckuck im Frühling zum ersten Mal hört, verzehren.

---

nicht ansehen dürfe, wenn er dann etwas fallen lasse (Feder, Beute, Exkrement), dann sterbe der, der das sehe, im Laufe des Jahres. Järvinen (2005: 87) enthält nur eine einschlägige Angabe, und zwar aus Valkjärvi auf der Karelischen Landenge, nach der es den Tod vorhersage, wenn ein Vogel, besonders der Kuckuck, im Fluge auf einen Menschen dreckt.

15. Mit der Passivableitung *-hallat* kommt allgemein zum Ausdruck, dass die durch das Verb ausgedrückte Handlung dem Subjekt widerfährt, ohne dass es dessen Wille oder Absicht gewesen wäre.

16. Zur Datierung des Werkes s. ebd., Vorwort 10.

Die Gefährdung durch den Ruf des Vogels ist, wie Nyman (1953: 38) feststellt, in einer zweifachen Übergangszeit gegeben, nämlich der vom Winter zum Frühling, die hier erstrangig ist, und der von der Nacht zum Tag. Und ein leerer Magen galt als „ein Zustand, wo man sowohl für schlechte als auch gute Einflüsse besonders empfänglich war" (Nyman 1953: 44; Weiteres ebd. 43–47; vgl. Hautala 1957: 19–22).

Den Kuckuck in einem Jahr gar nicht zu hören, ist, wie aus dem südsaamischen Røros überliefert ist, ebenfalls ein Unglück. Man lebt nicht mehr lange (Bergsland 1943: 314–315; 1987: 89). Auch nach Auffassung der Skoltsaamen von Paatsjoki steht dem Menschen nichts Gutes bevor, wenn er lange nicht den Kuckuck gehört hat (T. I. Itkonen 1931: 156); welche konkrete Folge es hat, geht aus der Mitteilung nicht hervor.

Es gibt auch ein paar Mitteilungen, nach denen die Gefahr, die vom ersten Ruf des Kuckucks im Frühling ausgeht, von bestimmten Gegebenheiten abhängt:

Nach Mitteilung von T. I. Itkonen (1946: 240) ist diese Gefahr von der Art des Rufes abhängig: Man vernimmt den Ruf des Kuckucks nach einem Jahr nicht mehr, wenn er heiser auf nüchternen Magen ruft. Die Angabe gilt offenbar für Utsjoki. Was mit diesem „heiser" gemeint ist, könnte aus einer Erzählung hervorgehen, die Matti Morottaja 1968 von einer Inarisaamin auf Tonband genommen hat (Morottaja 1996: 35–36). Hier halten sich mehrere – ebenfalls ungewöhnlich – Kuckucke gerade außerhalb des Zauns auf, „spielen" und toben, aber „sie kuckucken nicht, sondern sagen »kh-kh-kh«". Sie verhexen eine alte Frau, die genau ein Jahr später stirbt. „Man sagt, dass, wenn [ein Kuckuck] es so treibt, dass er erstickt[17], dann verhext er. Aber wenn er kuckuckt, dann verhext er nicht." Die Heiserkeit oder der an Ersticken erinnernde Laut ist die einzige Charakterisierung der Stimme in der saamischen Überlieferung. Klagende Laute gibt er nicht von sich, wie das der erwähnte Spukvogel *gåatal* tut.[18]

Die Position von Mensch und Vogel beim ersten Ruf des Kuckucks im Frühling ist nach einer Aufzeichnung aus Vapsten im Åselegebiet (etwa um 1905) entscheidend dafür, ob der Ruf Unheil oder Gutes

---

17. *poahčánaddađ* ‘ersticken' (E. Itkonen 1986–1991 II: 375, Nr. 3356.2); Satzbeispiele von dort s. Anm. 45 unter 10. Der Kuckuck als Prophet für Wetter und Wachstum.

18. Als Klagelaut wird der Ruf des Kuckucks besonders in Ost- und Südosteuropa gedeutet (Röhrich 1996: 546). Der Laut des Erstickens erinnert an das Röcheln eines Sterbenden.

bedeutet. Ist nämlich der Vogel auf der Sonnen- und der Mensch auf der Nachtseite, bedeutet es Ersteres, bei umgekehrter Position Letzteres (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107). Vgl. das oben unter 1 aus Arvidsjaur zum Unglückshäher Angeführte. Aus dem lulesaamischen Kvikkjokk stammt die Angabe (Drake 1918: 346), dass es ein schlechtes Zeichen sei, wenn der Kuckuck zwischen Mensch und Sonne ist, ein gutes, wenn der Mensch auf der Sonnenseite ist (Korrektur der Übersetzung Nenséns durch Drake).

## 3.2. Art und Ausmaß der Gefährdung

Die Art und das Ausmaß der Gefährdung wird – wenn sich die Mitteilung nicht auf die bloße Angabe beschränkt, es sei gefährlich (z. B. Turi) – unterschiedlich benannt. Nach einer Aufzeichnung von den Saamen Finnlands vom Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts bedeutet es den baldigen Tod, da man den Kuckuck (und entsprechend eine [Wild-]Gans) zum letzten Mal gehört habe (T. I. Itkonen 1946: 240, Fußnote, Hinweis auf J. E. Rosberg). Auch Laestadius (2011: 105, § 80) teilt mit, man glaube, der Kuckuck sage unter Umständen, von denen unten (s. 4. Das Ungewöhnliche als Gefahrenmoment) noch die Rede sein wird, den Tod voraus.

Nach anderen Quellen ist der Ruf nicht derart gefährlich. Jacob Fellman (1906 II: 118) nennt als Folge des Vogelbetrugs eine emotionale Störung: Der, der am Morgen auf nüchternen Magen einen Kuckuck hörte, wurde das ganze Jahr hindurch von seinen Nächsten nicht geliebt. Quelle hierfür ist trotz Abweichung wohl Leem (1767: 505), nach dem man in einer solchen Situation von einem Unglück betroffen wird, das sich eben auf das ganze folgende Jahr auswirkt, indem der Betroffene gegenüber seinen Nächsten übellaunig ist: „*Si cui jejuno cuculum primo vere canentem audivisse acciderit, hoc sibi inde infortunium ominabatur, ut per totum inseqventem annum male in proximum affectus foret.* […] virkede det hos ham et ondt Hiertelav til sin Næste.“

In Brännströms Aufzeichnungen von einem Waldsaamen aus Mausjaur in Arvidsjaur (Brännström 2017: 200, von 1931) ist zu lesen, dass man schläfrig werde, so dass man sich im folgenden Sommer kaum wach halten könne. Das Schläfrigwerden steht der Folge des „Vollgedrecktwerdens“ nahe, die aus Vapsten überliefert ist (Bäckman & Kjellstöm 1979: 107), nämlich, man werde „wie assna[19], das ist ein Baum, der seine Wachstumskraft verloren hat

---

19. Südsaam. *aasne* 'welk, faul, verfault' (Bergsland & Magga 2007: 20).

und am Welken ist". Nensén hat von einer Bauerntochter im weiter südlich gelegenen Dorotea notiert, man solle am Morgen erst ein wenig Speise für den Kuckuck zu sich nehmen, um nicht von ihm vollgedreckt zu werden, denn sonst magere man bis zum nächsten Frühjahr ab (Drake 1918: 266).[20]

Auch aus dem südsaamischen Vilhelmina wird die Gefahr zu verkümmern gemeldet. Der Kuckuck ist hier von den Saamen als ein *„asne lådde"* angesehen worden, wobei die Welkheit, die sich auf den Menschen überträgt, damit in Verbindung gebracht wird, dass der Kuckuck sich gewöhnlich auf vertrocknete Baumspitzen und Baumäste setzt (Tomasson 1988: 46).

Andere Quellen sind nicht so konkret. Es kann auch irgendein Unglück sein, wie aus der einzigen mir bekannten russischsprachigen Mitteilung, die wohl die Skoltsaamen meint, hervorgeht (Ostrovskij 1889: 329–330). Auch der Informant von Ahti Paulaharju aus Vetsikko in Utsjoki sprach von einem schlechten Omen für das betreffende Jahr, und dass bei richtiger Vorsorge (s. 5.1) „der Kuckucksruf kein Unglück verursachte" (SKS KRA Ahti Paulaharju 1961: 326).

Im Allgemeinen betrifft die negative Wirkung des Kuckucks unmittelbar den Menschen, es gibt jedoch auch Angaben, die andere Wirkungen nennen.

Helland (1906: 307) führt eine ganze Reihe von Folgen an, die die eingangs als die gefährlichsten genannten Vögel bewirken können: Wird man von diesen „beschissen" (*baikkáhallat*), misslingt alles: Die Milch wird nur zu Molke, der Rahm nicht zu Butter oder er wird zu Butterkatzenbutter[21], der Fisch auf dem Trockengestell bekommt Maden, die Rübenpflanzen werden wurmstichig. „Das ist so sicher, dass man auf manchen Gehöften den Rahm nicht in das Butterfass tut, wenn man beschissen (*udskidt*) oder betört (*daaret*) ist." Hier wird also eine negative Auswirkung hinsichtlich des Lebenserwerbs vorhergesagt. Auf eine andere Veröffentlichung

---

20. Vom Sterntaucher vollgedreckt zu werden, verursacht nach derselben Informantin Ekel vor aller Art von Fischen (a. a. O.). Der Sterntaucher ernährt sich vor allem von Fischen, so dass auch hier eine konkrete Verbindung zwischen dem Tier, seiner Lebens- und Ernährungsweise, und der Folge seines Rufes besteht. Vom Sterntaucher beschissen zu werden (*lomsketen*), ist schwedischerseits auch aus Vilhelmina tradiert (Nyman 1953: 6). Als Folge wird hier genannt, dass man das ganze Jahr hindurch blass ist.

21. Butter, die die durch Zauber hergestellte Butterkatze ihrer Schöpferin heimlich aus der Nachbarschaft herbeibringt; diese ist jedoch qualitativ verändert. – Bei Grundström (1923: 48; Jokkmokk, Sirkas) heißt es, der Kuckuck sei ein *murun*-Vogel. In Sirkas ist *murun* ein Wesen, das den Kühen die Milch entzieht, die Rene mager macht (Grundström 1946–1954 I: 541–542).

Hellands aus der Publikationsreihe Norges land og folk (*Nordland* II, 1908) verweist Qvigstad (1920: 132) in Anmerkung zu seiner Nr. 372. Unter dieser Nummer selbst findet sich eine Mitteilung von 1889 aus Balsfjord, nach der ebenfalls ein Schaden in der wirtschaftlichen Tätigkeit vermeldet wird: Im Sommer zerbricht der im Frühling mit nüchternem Magen vom Ruf des Kuckucks Überraschte alle seine Rechenstiele (Qvigstad 1920: 111). Eine ähnliche Folge des „Bescheißens" (*paskantaminen*) kann auch nach einem Informanten aus Talvadas in Utsjoki auftreten, „z. B. kann beim Mähen die Sense brechen". „Dann sage man: Du hast die Scheiße des Kuckucks bekommen." Den Beschiss nennt er eine Sache (*temppu*) aus alten Zeiten (TKU 67/111). Auch wenn es so nicht explizit ausgedrückt wird, so entsteht der Schaden in einem zentralen Aufgabenbereich der jeweils geschädigten Person, bei der (Haus-)Frau etwa, die die Milch verarbeitet, dem Mann, der Fische gefangen hat und trocknet usw. (vgl. Nyman 1953: 41–42).

T. Itkonen (1971: 36) hat 1955 in Utsjoki notiert, dass ein schlechtes Jahr für Heu und auf Feldern kommt, wenn man den Kuckuck im Frühling zum ersten Mal hört, ohne vorher gegessen zu haben. Die magische Kraft des Kuckucks über das Wachstum (s. auch unter 10) geht ferner aus einer Zeitangabe hervor, die T. I. Itkonen (1946: 241) von den Rentiersaamen in Inari wiedergibt: „Es geschah damals, als der Kuckuck das Kraut aus dem Boden hervorrief."[22]

Eine zeitlich stärker begrenzte Hinderung am Verrichten der täglichen Arbeit bringt es nach Mitteilung eines 1873 geborenen Saamen aus Tännäs mit sich, wenn man mangels „Kuckucksbissen" vom Kuckuck „beschissen" worden ist. Dem das widerfahren ist, darf in den ersten Tagen nicht in das Rengehege, wenn man zu melken beginnt, sonst gibt es ein Unglück. Danach darf er aber wieder hinein. Diesen Glauben bezeichnete der Informant als nicht mehr gültig (Ella Odstedt, ULMA 20227: 39, von 1941).

Gravierender ist der Schaden, wenn die Kühe sterben, wie der Kuckuck nach einer Aufzeichnung aus Tana weissagt, wenn er – analog zu Haus oder sonstiger Wohnstatt und Tod von Bewohnern (s. folgenden Abschnitt) – auf dem Viehstall ruft (Qvigstad 1920: 54, Nr. 89, aufgezeichnet 1890–1895).

Auch dem Ren kann der Ruf des Kuckucks Schaden bringen. Indirekt über den „beschissenen" Menschen kann dies nach einer Angabe

---

22. Itkonen merkt dazu an (ebd., Fußnote 2), die Auffassung, dass der Kuckuck das Kraut aus dem Boden hervorrufe, komme auch in der finnischen Volkspoesie vor.

geschehen, die T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 370, Fußnote 3) einem 1947 erschienenen Buch entnommen hat, indem die Rene einer vom Kuckuck beschissenen Person geweihlos werden können (ohne Ortsangabe). Dass man kein Glück mit der Herde hat, wenn man „beschissen" worden ist, geht auch aus einem erklärenden Zusatz von Tryggve Sköld (ULMA 21713: 432) zu einer Aufzeichnung aus Norrkaitum hervor. Und der Kuckuck kann, wie es aus dem südsaamischen Vilhelmina heißt, als *„sēfolatja-lådde"*[23] dem Ren Glück oder Unglück voraussagen und damit auch Krankheit prophezeien, konkret die Renpest. Und zwar nach Tomasson (1988: 47, Aufzeichnung 1917 von einem 1844 geborenen Saamen) dann, wenn ein Kuckuck sich während des Melkens, das bei den südlichen Saamen intensiv betrieben wurde, aufdringlich zeigt und um das Rengehege flattert oder sich sogar auf der Holzumzäunung niederlassen will – sich also auf eine der menschlichen Behausung ähnliche Weise nähert.

Ein Verblassen der Vorstellungen ist wohl darin zu erkennen, dass nach einer unpublizierten Aufzeichnung von 1961 aus Utsjoki, Vetsikko, der Ruf auf nüchternen Magen im Sommer ein schlechtes Omen für den betreffenden Tag darstellt (SKS KRA Ahti Paulaharju 1961, 326)[24].

Daraus, dass der Kuckuck den Tod prophezeit, leitet sich ab, dass er nach einer Einzelaufzeichnung einen – viele Menschenleben kostenden – Krieg vorhersagen kann. Ein Krieg kommt – sagt man lt. einem Informanten aus Talvadas –, wenn man etwas Ungewöhnliches hört, und er bricht aus, wenn der Kuckuck im Herbst ruft (TKU 67/282; zum Ungewöhnlichen vgl. folgenden Abschnitt, zum normalen Verstummen des Vogels s. oben unter 2).

Dass der Ruf des Kuckucks die Beeren des Vorjahres verdirbt, ungenießbar macht, weil er auf sie „macht" (Turi 1992: 160; auch 2010: 118), wird in der zugehörigen Fußnote in der Übersetzung (Turi 1992: 160) zu einer scherzhaften Schuldzuweisung an den Kuckuck erklärt: Der schmelzende Schnee lässt die nun der Sonnenwärme ausgesetzten Beeren in der Natur verderben. Dass man vorjährige Beeren nicht essen dürfe, weil sie vom Kuckuck beschmutzt seien, wird auch von den Inarisaamen überliefert (Koskimies & Itkonen 1978: 412–413, von 1886; vgl. T. I. Itkonen 1946: 240–241, hier nach Beeren Zusatz: (Preisel- und Krähenbeeren)).

---

23. Südsaam. *seafoeladtje* 'hellseherisch; Person mit einem zweiten Gesicht' (Bergsland & Magga 2007: 250).
24. Unter 327 heißt es: „Dieses Brotstück wurde manchmal auch am Tage im Sommer [bei sich] getragen."

### 4.  Das Ungewöhnliche als Gefahrenmoment

Neben dem Ruf des Kuckucks ist auch von Bedeutung, wo er sich aufhält. Das gilt für diesen wie auch für andere Tiere, die Bedeutung für das Schicksal der Menschen haben können. Eine Gefahr besteht dann, wenn die Scheu vor und die Distanz zu den Menschen nicht gewahrt bleibt. T. I. Itkonen (1946: 239, Fußnote 4) hat eine kleine Zusammenstellung aus der Literatur, die sich leicht erweitern lässt. In Nesseby in der östlichsten Finnmark bedeutet es Unglück, wenn der Kuckuck in der Nähe der Häuser ruft (Qvigstad 1920: 111, Nr. 371, aufgezeichnet 1891 oder 1896; vgl. Qvigstad & Sandberg 1887: 113). Konkrete Vorstellungen, wer dann betroffen ist, existieren im unweit gelegenen Tana, wonach der Vogel den Tod des Hausherrn oder der Hausfrau weissagt, wenn er auf Zaunpfählen oder auf dem First des Hauses ruft (ebd. 54, Nr. 89, von 1890–1895). Das gleiche Schicksal ereilt Hausherr oder Hausfrau im westlicher, ebenfalls an der Küste gelegenen Lyngen, wenn der Kuckuck auf dem Hausfirst ruft, allgemein jemanden im Haus, wenn er dabei auf der Brunnenstange sitzt (ebd. Nr. 88, von 1889). Bei Helland (1906: 307) heißt es, wenn sich der Kuckuck um die Häuser schare, gehe es bald um Tod oder Unglück. L. L. Laestadius schreibt in seinen „Fragmenten" (2011: 105, § 80), man glaube, der Kuckuck sage den Tod vorher, wenn er sich auf dem Dach der Behausung zum Rufen niederlasse und der Hörende nüchtern sei (vgl. 3.1). In einer jüngeren Aufzeichnung von 1967 aus Vuotso im nordfinnischen Sodankylä (Sammallahti 1975: 104–105) nennt Elsa-Marja Aikio – die beteuert, an dem Glauben „ist was dran" – als Folge des beständigen, täglichen Rufens des Kuckucks im Sommer vor dem Winterkrieg, also 1939, dass dann je zwei junge Männer aus zwei Häusern gefallen seien. „In ihnen [den Kuckucken] ist Zauber, man nannte es *tij ꞏta*[25], so war das". Die Informantin hatte diese ihre Erzählung vom Kuckuck eingeleitet mit der Bemerkung, der Kuckuck sei richtig ein „*koorhta*", ein Unglücksvogel.[26] Nicht „hier bei uns" geschehen bestätigen kann eine Informantin aus Talvadas in Utsjoki den Glauben der alten Leute, dass jemand im Haus stirbt, wenn der Kuckuck auf dem Haus ruft, „was nicht gewöhnlich ist" (TKU 67/289). In einer anderen Tonbandaufnahme aus demselben Jahr aus

---

25. Register S. 199: *tij ꞏta* (taika). Schriftsprachlich *diida* 'Zauber'.
26. Eine Entlehnung von finn. dialektal *kortto* 'Verderben, böser Blick'. Von *koorhta-lod ꞏdii* 'Unglücksvogel' spricht Elsa-Marja Aikio im Zusammenhang mit Meise (*cizáš*) und Auerhahn (*čukča*) (ebd. 105, 107, s. auch 189).

Talvadas wird aber vom Tod eines namentlich genannten Mannes erzählt. Danach hatte der Kuckuck den ganzen Frühling hindurch auf den Zäunen und darum herum gerufen und sogar durch das Fenster geschaut und dabei gerufen (TKU 67/132).[27] Dass es ein Todesomen ist, wenn der Kuckuck sich den ganzen Sommer über beim Haus aufhält, ist im gleichen Jahr auch aus einem anderen Dorf in Utsjoki, aus Karigasniemi, mitgeteilt worden (TKU 67/277b). Auch aus Lyngen (Gálggojávri) wird vermeldet, dass der Kuckuck Tod vorhersagt, und wenn er kommt und auf dem Haus oder der Hütte ruft, es ein Vorzeichen für den Tod im selben Jahr ist (TKU 65/19/1). In einem Memorat aus Talvadas, Utsjoki, ist das den Tod ankündigende Vorzeichen der Nähe mit dem des Füßezeigens (s. unten unter 6) kombiniert. Der Kuckuck ist im Frühjahr auf dem Hof, am Brunnen herumgeflogen und hat gar auf der Brunnenkurbel geschlafen; so etwas hatte die Erzählerin vorher noch nicht gesehen (TKU 67/130; vgl. TKU 67/100, dieselbe Informantin). Ein ebenfalls in Talvadas wohnhafter Informant nennt neben der Nähe – der Vogel lief auf dem Zaun hin und her –, dass er so zahm war, dass man ihn beinahe ergreifen konnte (TKU 67/131).

Auch aus den südlicheren Gebieten liegen entsprechende Nachrichten vor. Von K. B. Wiklund hat Emilie Demant-Hatt, wie aus ihrem Reisebericht aus den Jahren 1907–1908 hervorgeht (Demant-Hatt 1913: 173, Anmerkung 13 zu S. 10), erfahren, dass es in den südlichen schwedischen Lappmarken als böses Vorzeichen gilt, wenn sich Vögel auf die Zeltstangen am Rauchloch setzen, was bedeute, dass jemand im Zelt sterben werde. Dies wird nicht näher lokalisiert. Konkret liegt durch Brännström (2017: 145) aus Arvidsjaur (Malmesjaur) von Waldsaaminnen (Umesaaminnen) die Nachricht (von 1932) vor, dass es ein Todesfall oder eine Krankheit sei, wenn sich der Kuckuck auf das Wohnhaus setze. Eine andere Waldsaamin aus Arvidsjaur (Araksuolo), eine Grundschullehrerin, formulierte es 1931 so: „Wenn der Kuckuck dreist ist und nahe an die Hütte (*kåta*) kommt, möchte man fast behaupten, dass irgendein Todesfall oder so eintritt, man wird wie etwas unruhig" (Brännström 2017: 82). Die Auffassung, dass der Ruf eines Kuckucks nahe dem Haus eine „Trauerbotschaft" sei, ist auch noch

---

27. Die Erzählung verbindet Kuckucksglauben und die bei den Saamen wichtigen Traumerscheinungen. Der Mann hatte offenbar im Wald einen Schlaganfall bekommen und sich seiner Frau, noch am Leben, in der Nacht im Traum gezeigt. Sie endet mit der Bemerkung: „Es war, als ob der Kuckuck angekündigt hätte, jemand von euch geht, er kam so nahe, dass er sogar durch das Fenster hineinschaute."

südlicher vorhanden. Ella Odstedt hat sie 1941 in Tännäs in Härjedalen von einer 1859 geborenen Informantin gehört (ULMA 20227: 40).

Auch für die Fischersaamen von Inari (also die Inarisaamen) gilt nach T. I. Itkonen (1946: 239), es bedeute nichts Gutes, wenn sich der Kuckuck bei einem Gehöft aufzuhalten beginne, für Utsjoki, wenn er über das Haus fliege oder über dem Kopfe rufe, und Itkonen fügt (ebd., Fußnote 4) noch eine Quelle für Karesuando (Karesuvanto) hinzu, nach der die Annäherung an ein Gehöft Unglück bedeute. Auch die Skoltsaamen von Paatsjoki meinten, der Kuckuck prophezeie Schlimmes, wenn er über die Hütte fliege (Itkonen 1931: 156). Und Turi (1992: 160; 2010: 118) weiß gar von dem „merkwürdigen Ereignis" zu berichten, dass ein Kuckuck – noch aufdringlicher – in eine Lappenkote gekommen sei und angefangen habe, Fleisch von dem Fleischgerüst zu essen, und das hätten alte Leute noch nie gesehen. „Und in der Kote starben in einem Sommer drei Menschen."

In all den Fällen, wo sich der Kuckuck in unmittelbarer Nähe des Hauses, Gehöftes aufhält oder gar in das Zelt eindringt, geht es um das Ungewöhnliche im Verhalten des Tieres, das eine Deutung erfordert – was beim Kuckuck besonders gegeben ist, da er an sich ein scheuer Vogel ist.[28] Das Ungewöhnliche als bestimmendes Moment galt auch schon bei der ungewöhnlichen Stimme, den heiseren oder erstickenden Lauten, die der Kuckuck von sich gibt (3.1).

Nach einer Aufnahme aus Ullatti im schwedischen Gällivare beruht das Ungewöhnliche in Zeitraum und Anzahl der Rufe (magische Zahl drei), mit denen der Kuckuck den Tod des Ehemannes der Informantin vorhersagt: Drei Monate vorher rief er, wie das Ehepaar hörte, drei Mal (TKU 67/172).

Anzumerken ist hier, dass, anders als beim Vogelbetrug, in den erwähnten Fällen außer bei Laestadius keine enge, feste zeitliche Bindung gegeben ist. Eine Ausnahme könnte aber auch die erwähnte Mitteilung von Helland (1906: 307) sein, die auf die Nachricht folgt, dass, wenn der Kuckuck im Frühling, wenn er kommt, den Flüssen entlang hin und her fliegt, es im Sommer wenig Lachs gibt. Das Ungewöhnliche liegt hier in der Flugroute des Vogels. Der Bezug zum Menschen wiederum besteht in der Einschränkung für den Lebensunterhalt durch geringeren Fang.[29]

---

28. S. auch unter 10. Der Kuckuck als Prophet für Wetter und Wachstum.
29. Nicht mit einem ersten Ruf im Frühling verbunden ist eine Begebenheit, die Helland (1906: 307–308) wiedergibt. Ein Rentiersaame prophezeite ein großes

## 5. Abwehrmaßnahmen gegen den Vogelschaden

### 5.1. Der „Vogelbissen"

Gegen den „Betrug" durch den Kuckuck wie durch andere Vögel kann man sich schützen, indem man etwas isst oder trinkt, bevor man hinausgeht. Es ist dies eine Abwehrmaßnahme, die auch sonst in Europa getroffen worden ist. T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 370–371, Fußnote 3) hat für das Saamische aus Suometar 1857, Nr. 42 (Itkonen: A. Andelin?) auch Angaben für die Folgen bei anderen Vögeln übernommen, die meist wirtschaftlicher Art sind, indem z. B. der Prachttaucher verursacht, dass man im Winter schlecht Milch bekommt. Beim Kuckuck ist dieser Schutz sehr wichtig, weil die Folgen des „Betrugs", wie erwähnt, besonders gravierend sein können. Die Nahrung, die man zum Schutz zu sich nimmt, wird „Vogelbissen" (lulesaam. *låddebihttá*) genannt (Wiklund (1906: 250) führt für Gällivare „*lottē-pihttā*" an). Aus Vapsten liegt die Angabe vor, man nenne den Happen „*lattiebetta*" (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107).[30] Von dieser Schutzmaßnahme berichtet das Wortmaterial aus der Lule-, Pite- und Ume-Lappmark enthaltende Wörterbuch von Lindahl und Öhrling (1780: 112; 2015: 226): „låddebitta, ita apellabatur cibi buccæ, quam mane evigilantes olim sumebant Lappones, verno tempore, ne jejunis avium primo vere advenientium audire ollis accideret cantus, quod nunquam

---

Unglück, nachdem er unterwegs mehrere Tage hintereinander den Kuckuck „Schaden und Verlust von Menschenleben" hatte rufen hören. Dies Unglück bestand in einem Bergrutsch, der eine gewaltige Wasserbewegung im Meer auslöste, durch die Häuser mitgerissen wurden und 18 Menschen umgekommen sein sollen.

30. Vgl. südsaam. *ledtie-bæhta*, *ledtien-bæhta* 'kleines leichtes Frühstück, ein Bissen Frühstück (*et stykke morgenmat*)' (Bergsland & Magga 2007: 169). Drake (1917: 265) führt nach Nensén für das lulesaamische Kvikkjokk auch das Verb *låddådet* 'einen Vogelbissen nehmen' an. – Ein Informant aus Gautsträsk hat Ella Odstedt (ULMA 18704: 146) mitgeteilt, von „*geähkabihta*" sprechen gehört zu haben, dazu aber keine Glaubensvorstellung. Von einer anderen Gewährsperson aus Gautsträsk erfuhr Odstedt (ULMA 18704: 152), dass sie nicht so viel von Glaubensvorstellungen bezüglich des „Kuckucksbissens" gehört habe, so dass die Vorstellungen zu Kuckucksbaum (s. unten unter 6) und -bissen hier weitgehend verloren gegangen zu sein scheinen. Eine junge Saamin aus dem Saamendorf Ran erklärte, sie sagten „*geärkabihta*". Sie wusste aber nichts Näheres darüber (ULMA 18704: 146).

non malum futurum esse omen crediderunt, præsertim si cuculi exaudissent vocem." Der schwedische Text dazu lautet in Übersetzung: „Låddebitta, wird ein Bissen Speise genannt, den die Lappen früher aßen, sobald sie erwachten, damit sie nicht »betört« (*bli dårade*[31]) würden von den im Frühling ankommenden Vögeln." Aus der schwedischsprachigen Fortsetzung geht hervor, dass es in einem solchen Fall besonders der Kuckuck war, den man als den „unglücklichsten" (d. h. das größte Unglück bringenden) Vogel ansah. Sigrid Drake (1918: 265–266) hat die einschlägigen Aufzeichnungen Nenséns in einem „*Lådde-bitta*, fågelbit" überschriebenen Unterabschnitt zusammengestellt, der in das Kapitel „Heilkunst und Gesundheitspflege" eingegangen ist. Diese hatte bereits K. B. Wiklund (1906: 249–250) aus den seinerzeit noch unpublizierten Sammlungen Nenséns angeführt. Aus dem zentraleren nordsaamischen Gebiet und östlich davon ist Verfasser ein entsprechendes Wort nicht begegnet. Fellman (1906 II: 118) hat zwar einen Artikel *Lådde bitta*, doch dürfte er diesen Begriff gleichsam als ein geeignet erscheinendes Stichwort „entlehnt" haben, um Auffassungen und Verhaltensweisen aus seinem näheren Umfeld zu beschreiben.

T. I. Itkonen (1946: 240) berichtet von einer sorgsamen Vorbereitung gegen das „Pech", das der Vogel bringt: „Man pflegte schon am Abend vor dem Schlafengehen am Brustteil des Kittels ein Fleisch- oder Brotstück anzubringen, damit man es dann am Morgen nicht zu essen vergäße". Auch Ahti Paulaharju hat von seinem Informanten aus Vetsikko in Utsjoki erfahren, dass man bestrebt war, morgens beim Hinausgehen vor dem Essen ein kleines Brotstück oder dergleichen am Revers zu haben, von dem man leicht ein wenig abbeißen konnte, bevor der Kuckuck rufen konnte. Die Ängstlichsten hätten sicherheitshalber schon abgebissen, bevor sie zur Tür hinaus gewesen wären (SKA KRA Ahti Paulaharju 1961: 327). Laestadius (2011: 104, § 78) teilt mit, wie man sich gegen die Unglück verheißenden Laute bestimmter Frühlingsvögel schützte und diese Unglück verheißende Kraft wirkungslos machte, durch „*lodde-pitta*", den

---

31. Schwed. *dåra* bedeutet gewöhnlich 'betören', SAOB gibt dafür auch als nunmehr nur folkloristisch an: „von bestimmten Vögeln, insbesondere dem Kuckuck: 'magische Wirkung von verderblicher Beschaffenheit (auf jdn.) ausüben, (jdn.) verzaubern'". Angemerkt sei, dass *gök* selbst auf den indoeuropäischen Stamm *\*gheu-* zurückgeht, der die Bedeutung 'schelten, verspotten, zum Narren halten' hat (Tillhagen 1978: 160).

'Vogelbissen'. Einige der Saamen „sind so vorsichtig, dass sie mit einem Speisebissen unter dem Kopf schlafen, damit er sogleich zur Hand ist, sobald man seine Augen öffnet". Ella Odstedt hat 1941 im südsaamischen Tännäs (Härjedalen) von der Fürsorge gehört, die man aus Furcht vor dem Kuckucksruf anderen zukommen ließ. Die in Frostviken geborene Informantin erzählte, ihre Mutter habe sich, sowie sie den Kuckuck das erste Mal gehört habe, beeilt, ihren Kindern einen Bissen Essen zu geben, damit sie nicht beschissen würden. „Wer den Kuckuck am Morgen selbst gehört hatte, pflegte sich zu beeilen und anderen Essen zu geben, bevor sie ihn hören würden" (ULMA 20229: 2).[32] Auch aus dem ebenfalls südsaamischen Vilhelmina berichtet ein Informant von der Fürsorglichkeit der Mutter, die ihn mit einem Stück Fleisch in der Hand weckte, als er Kind war, bevor der Kuckuck zum zweiten Mal rufen konnte (Tomasson 1988: 46–47).[33]

Aus Utsjoki (Vetsikko) stammt aus dem Jahr 1961 die singuläre Angabe, dass man heimlich vom Brot oder dergleichen abbeißen musste, ohne dass jemand es sah oder bemerkte (SKS KRA Ahti Paulaharju 1961: 327).

In bäuerlichen Gemeinschaften bestand der „Vogelbissen" oft aus einem Bissen Brot. Insbesondere wo Brot nicht so leicht zu erhalten war und keine so bedeutende Rolle in der Deckung des täglichen Nahrungsbedarfs spielte, konnten auch andere Nahrungsmittel den gleichen Zweck erfüllen, wie das Fleisch, von dem bereits die Rede war. Auch Fisch konnte dienen. Nach einer Informantin aus Talvadas passiert nichts, wenn man Fisch gegessen hatte, bevor man den Vogel rufen hörte (TKU 67/100; sonst kommt schlechtes Wetter). Für die Fischersaamen von Inari war ein Schutz gegen den „Beschiss" des Kuckucks dann gegeben, wenn es sich dabei um selbst gefangenen Fisch handelte (T. I. Ikonen 1946: 239–240). Dieses „Selbst-Gefangen" von Fisch bei den Inarisaamen soll letztlich heißen, dass die betreffende Person oder Familie so viel Nahrung zur Verfügung hatte, um

---

32. Dies auch ohne Quellenangabe Hammarin (1990: 45). – Warum es ein „gutes Zeichen" war, wenn man gegessen hatte, bevor man den Kuckuck hörte, konnte die Informantin, wie die Aufzeichnerin anmerkte, nicht näher erklären. – Entsprechend aus Frostviken Nyman (1953: 17, aus ULMA 15104).
33. Eine 1890 geborene Informantin aus Jalvi in Utsjoki sagte abweichend von der sonstigen Tradition, man müsse im Frühling abends vor dem Schlafengehen essen, damit der Kuckuck der betreffenden Person nicht die ganze Nacht rufe (TKU 67/253).

den Mangel zum Ausgang des Winters verkraften und mit dem beginnenden Frühling durch frischen und nahrungsreichen Fisch neue Energie sammeln zu können. Es geht hier also um ausreichende und die Mangelernährung des Winters ausgleichende Nahrung, nicht in erster Linie um bestimmte Nahrung, denn auch eine Flüssigkeit zu sich zu nehmen hilft. In dem unter Nesseby und Polmak eingeordneten Kapitel „Etwas über die Abgötterverehrung in Lappland in alten Tagen" – in dem auch zu lesen ist, dass die Menschen einst den Vögeln des Himmels dadurch dienten, dass sie auf deren Schrei achteten –, wird nämlich als Schutz gegen „das eine oder andere Unglück" neben dem Essen auch Milch oder ein anderes Getränk genannt (Qvigstad & Sandberg 1887: 113). Nach Meinung von Nordsaamen hilft vor dem Hinausgehen neben Essen auch Kaffee zu trinken (und sich anzuziehen) (T. I. Itkonen 1948 II: 370). Im Schwedischen existiert der Begriff *kaffegök*, das ist ein Kaffee mit Branntwein, der seine Benennung nach dem Getränk erhalten hat, das man ursprünglich am Morgen als Schutz gegen den Kuckuck, schwed. *gök*, zu sich genommen hat (vgl. u. a. Brännström 1929: 164–165).[34]

Die Funktion der Nahrungsaufnahme erklärt Vilkuna (1929: 114) so, dass der Betrug des Kuckucks in eben das Gegessene oder Getrunkene gehen und später ohne Schaden für den Menschen auf natürlichem Wege wieder ausgeschieden werden kann.

## 5.2. Der Biss in Rinde und Zweig

Die zweite Abwehrmaßnahme gegen den Kuckucksbetrug besteht darin, in einen Zweig oder auch in die Rinde eines Baumes zu beißen. Bei Leem (1767: 505) heißt es, dass der Betroffene in die Rinde eines Baumes beiße und drei Mal gegen den Lauf der Sonne herumlaufe, sich versichernd, dass der Ruf des Kuckucks, den er nüchtern gehört habe, ihm nicht die

---

34. Es geht auch ohne den Kaffee. Hammarin (1990: 44) und Svanberg (2016: 57) zitieren die älteste Angabe zum Vogelbetrug aus Jämtland, aus Johann Otto Hagströms 1751 in Stockholm erschienener *Jemtlands oeconomiska beskrifning* ('Ökonomische Beschreibung Jämtlands'; Reisebeobachtungen vom Sommer 1749): „wenn jemand morgens mit nüchternem Magen hinausgeht und den Ruf eines Vogels, besonders der Krähe oder des Kuckucks, hört, so sagt man, der Kuckuck betört (*dåra*) ihn, deshalb nehmen sie einen Schnaps für den Kuckuck, bevor sie hinausgehen".

genannte schlimme Wirkung (s. oben unter 3.2) antun würde. Ebenfalls aus der Finnmark ist die von Helland (1906: 307, von dort T. I. Itkonen 1946: 240, Fußnote) übermittelte Maßnahme, man solle drei Mal um eine Kiefer herumgehen und etwas von ihrer Rinde essen. Auch nach Fellman (1906 II: 118) hilft es, drei Mal um eine Kiefer herumzugehen und etwas von ihrer Rinde zu essen und sich so die Liebe seines Nächsten zu erhalten (auch hier ist wieder, s. oben unter 3.2, davon auszugehen, dass Leem die Quelle für Fellmans Mitteilung ist). Mehrfach wird der Biss namentlich in einen grünen Zweig oder in einen in Saft stehenden Baum erwähnt. Von einem 1830 geborenen Saamen aus dem finnmarkischen Polmak stammt, man müsse in den Wald gehen und drei Mal die Rinde eines jungen Birkenbaumes abnagen, damit dieser statt seiner verdorre (Qvigstad 1920: 111, Nr. 370a). Aus gleicher Quelle rührt die Angabe her, man solle sich im Wald einen jungen Birkenbaum[35] ausersehen und dessen Rinde auf der Südseite abnagen; dann geschehe einem nichts Böses (ebd., Nr. 370b). Hier ist, wie beim Ruf aus einer bestimmten Himmelsrichtung, vom Süden als der positiv besetzten Himmelsrichtung die Rede (s. 7. Der Kuckuck sagt die Länge des Lebens voraus). Grundström hat in Sirkas (Jokkmokk) von einem seiner lulesaamischen Informanten erfahren, man habe, wenn man vom Kot der Vögel – hier also ist der „Beschiss" ganz wörtlich zu nehmen – getroffen worden sei, um einen Busch herumgehen und mit den Zähnen die Spitzen der Zweige abbeißen müssen, wodurch man selbst geheilt werde, der Busch jedoch verwelke (Grundström 1929: 72; von dort zitiert auch Fjellström 1986: 404). An anderer Stelle heißt es bei Grundström (1923: 48–49, derselbe Informant), man müsse um einen Busch herumgehen und mit den Zähnen von den Spitzen der Zweige Rinde abreißen, um sich gegen den Kuckuck zu wehren (*att klara sig mot göken*). Auch aus dem südlichen saamischen Traditionsgebiet liegt eine entsprechende Nachricht vor: Die Gefahr des Verwelkens durch Vogelbetrug wird nach Auskunft aus Vapsten in der Åsele-Lappmark gebannt, wenn man augenblicklich, wenn man vom Vogel vollgedreckt (*baikatellem*, *nedträckad*) wird, in einen Baum beißt, der dann an Stelle des Betrogenen verwelkt (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107).

---

35. Der Biss namentlich in eine Birke wird auch in den Belegen Nymans (1953: 3–8) aus verschiedenen Gegenden Schwedens genannt. Daneben begegnet auch „frischer", d. h. frisch grünender, Baum oder allgemein Baum.

Ein ganz zuverlässiges Mittel ist der Biss in einen Zweig (des nächsten Baumes) jedoch nach einer älteren Aufzeichnung nicht. T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 370–371, Fußnote 3) zitiert aus Suometar 1857, Nr. 42: „Wenn der Zweig vertrocknet, ist der Kuckucksruf bedeutungslos, wenn der Zweig aber nicht vertrocknet, stirbt der, der den Kuckuck gehört hat."

Diese Art der Gefahrenabwehr ist aus dem saamischen Traditionsgebiet weniger belegt als der Schutz durch Nahrungsaufnahme. Das gilt auch für das gesamte Skandinavien, während sie im Baltikum sehr allgemein ist und auch in Finnland begegnet (Nyman 1953: 52).[36]

## 6. Die Farbe der Füße als Vorzeichen

Ein deutliches – hier nun optisches – Vorzeichen für Glück oder Unglück stellt auch die Farbe der Füße des Kuckucks dar. Die wenigen einschlägigen Nachrichten hierzu sind regional sehr begrenzt. Bei den Skoltsaamen sagt eine Farbe den Tod durch Ertrinken voraus, die andere einen gewöhnlichen Tod, wie Paulaharju (1921: 153) mitteilt: „Manchmal fliegt er auf den Bootsmast eines auf dem Meer Fahrenden und setzt sich und zeigt dem, der durch Ertrinken zu Tode kommt, rote Füße, schwarze Füße aber dem, der einen gewöhnlichen Tod erleidet."[37] T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 371) führt ebenfalls für die Skoltsaamen an, der Kuckuck setze sich manchmal auf die Erde und zeige dem, der ertrinken wird, rote Füße, anderen schwarze. Aus Nesseby am Varangerfjord hat Qvigstad (1920: 110, Nr. 369b) dank einer Aufzeichnung von H. O. Reppen aus dem Jahr 1903 mitteilen können, dass rote Füße Krankheit weissagen, schwarze aber Trauer. Wenn sie aber blau sind, Glück und Heil. Die Prophezeiung kommt hier auf Initiative des Menschen zustande, der nach

---

36. Gegen den Betrug durch Vögel kann man sich auch, wie Nyman (1953: 51) von Harald Grundström erfahren hat, durch die Wurzel des bei den Saamen in Medizin und Magie eine bedeutende Rolle spielenden Engelwurzes (*Angelica archangelica*) schützen. Diese ganz singuläre, nicht näher spezifizierte Mitteilung dürfte sich auf das lulesaamische Gebiet beziehen.

37. Übernommen von Storå (1971: 204). Etwas verkürzt und verändert auch T. I. Itkonen (1946: 241). – Die hier wichtige Farbe der Füße und ihr Zeigen fehlt in der aus Kauhajoki in Etelä-Pohjanmaa mitgeteilten Vorstellung, die sich somit auf das Ungewöhnliche reduziert: „Wenn der Kuckuck auf den Mast eines Schiffes fliegt, sagt er (*tietää*) Schiffbruch voraus" (Järvinen 2005: 86).

Meinung der Alten den sichtbaren Vogel auffordern soll, seine Füße zu zeigen, wenn er keinen Laut von sich gibt. Die Prophezeiung gilt dem Fragenden und seiner Hausgemeinschaft.

Das Zeigen der Füße und deren Farbe wird auch in einigen Tonbandaufnahmen aus Talvadas in Utsjoki thematisiert. Wie oben bereits gesagt, kann das als Vorzeichen in Kombination mit der allzu großen Nähe des Kuckucks erfolgen. In der einen Aufnahme (TKU 67/100) sitzt der Vogel nicht auf einem Ast, sondern kommt ungewöhnlicherweise auf die Erde herab und zeigt seine gelben Füße. Gleiches geschieht in einer anderen Aufzeichnung von derselben Informantin. Es ist ein „Zaubervogel", noch am selben Tag stirbt ihr Mann (TKU 67/121). Man sagt, fügt sie in einer dritten Aufnahme hinzu, dass die einen Kuckucke schwarze, die anderen gelbe Füße hätten (TKU 67/130). Ein jüngerer Vertreter der gleichen Talvadaser Familie führt an, dass der Tod in der Familie sei, deren Behausung er sich genähert hat, wenn er seine gelben Füße zeigt (TKU 70/75).[38]

Aus Vilhelmina im Åselegebiet, also fast am anderen Ende des hier in Rede stehenden Traditionsgebietes, ist außer der Farbe auch die Sichtbarkeit der Beine überhaupt ein Kriterium. Ein unvermutet heranflatternder Kuckuck, der sich vor einem auf einen Baumstumpf oder trockenen Baumast setzt, seine Flügel hebt und sich streckt, so dass die Beine sichtbar werden – die, wie es heißt, selten oder nicht zu sehen sind (also wieder das Moment des Ungewöhnlichen)[39] –, weissagt Glück oder Unglück, je nachdem, ob sie rot oder weiß sind. Einen vor einem mit den Flügeln schlagenden Kuckuck pflegte man aufzufordern, seine Beine zu zeigen. Tat er das nicht, war weder das eine noch das andere zu erwarten (Tomasson 1988: 47, Aufzeichnung von 1917). Der Mensch tritt hier durch seine Aufforderung aktiv gegenüber dem Kuckuck auf.

---

38. Ausdrücklich mit dem ersten Kuckucksruf im Frühling verbunden wird der Blick auf die Füße in Uurainen in Keski-Suomi: „Wenn man im Frühling den Kuckuck zum ersten Mal rufen hört, so schaut man, was für Haar er unter dem Fuß hat: Wenn es rot ist, weissagt es ein fröhliches Leben, wenn schwarz, dann den Tod, wenn grau, dann Kummer, wenn weiß, dann so ein gewöhnliches" (Järvinen 2005: 89–90).

39. Auch die Informantin aus Talvadas (TKU 67/121) hatte auf das Besondere hingewiesen: „Die Alten haben erzählt, dass der Kuckuck seine Füße nicht zeigt."

### 7. Der Kuckuck sagt die Länge des Lebens voraus

Das prophetische Vermögen des Kuckucks hinsichtlich Leben und Tod äußert sich auch darin, dass der Vogel die Lebenszeit voraussagt. Bei T. I. Itkonen (1948 II: 370) heißt es, er kuckucke als Prophet allen Lebenden das Lebensjahr (ohne genaue Ortsangabe). Es ist dies eine in Europa verbreitete Vorstellung, die schon aus dem Hochmittelalter belegt ist (Tillhagen 1978: 168–169). Die Lebensdauer zu erfahren, ist nach Auffassung der Skoltsaamen insofern einfach, als man nur daran denken muss, wenn der Kuckuck zufällig über einen fliegt. Dann setzt er sich sogleich auf einen Baum und ruft (Paulaharju 1921: 153). Nach Laestadius (2011: 105, § 80) hat der Mensch, der unter einem Baum sitzt, auf dem der Vogel ruft, so viele Lebensjahre wie der Ruf ertönt. Auch nach einer Angabe von Qvigstad (1920: 110, Nr. 369a, von 1903) zu Nesseby ganz im Osten der Finnmark gibt der Kuckuck zu wissen, wie die Lebenszeit bemessen ist, nach ihr ist jedoch die Kürze oder Länge des weiteren Lebens abhängig von der Himmelsrichtung, in die der Vogel ruft. Ruft er nach Norden hin, weissagt er ein kurzes, ruft er nach Süden hin, ein langes Leben. Der Norden begegnet hier als die Richtung des Todes oder allgemein des Bösen.[40] Grundlage der Angabe unter Nr. 369a ist ganz offensichtlich eine Erzählung, die H. O. Reppen 1903 von der Mutter der Toten für Qvigstad aufgezeichnet hat, die den Ruf selbst als Vorzeichen verstanden hat. Sie und ihre Tochter hatten beim Grasmähen den Kuckuck laut gegen Norden rufen hören (Qvigstad 1927: 338–339). In Gratangen in der Provinz Troms, tornesaamisches Gebiet, hat Qvigstad 1929 von seinem dortigen Informanten gehört,

---

40. Auch in schwedischen (Merk-)Sprüchen (*ramsor*) wie dem aus Schonen stammenden: „*Norregök är sorgegök, Östergök är tröstergök, Södergök är dödergök, Västergök är bästergök*" ('Nordkuckuck ist Sorgenkuckuck, Ostkuckuck ist Trostkuckuck, Südkuckuck ist Todeskuckuck, Westkuckuck ist bester Kuckuck'; Tillhagen 1978: 166, wo auch entsprechende Sprüche aus anderen Gegenden Schwedens angeführt sind) werden Auswirkungen des Rufes nach den Himmelsrichtungen eingeordnet, wobei hier allerdings lautliche Übereinstimmungen, der Reim, für den Inhalt des Rufes bestimmend sind (ebd.). Schwedische Sprüche aus Jämtland finden sich Hammarin (1990: 82–83); zu der ältesten Aufzeichnung von hier wird angemerkt, ursprünglich habe es *sör – smör* (Butter) geheißen, was gegen *söder – döder* ausgetauscht worden sei (83), wodurch hier Glück in Unglück, eine Aussage zu Wetter und Wachstum in eine zur Lebenszeit umgewandelt wurde. In Lima in Dalarna wurde der Kuckuck Butterkuckuck (*smörgucku*) genannt,

dass es Hoffnung auf ein längeres Leben gebe, wenn man den Kuckuck im Süden hört. „Wenn ich ihn im Norden höre, werde ich wohl nicht alt" (NFS Q 32: 114/118). Die Himmelsrichtung spielt auch eine entscheidende Rolle bei einer Angabe von Helland (1906: 307): Wie bei den unter Vogelbetrug (3.1) genannten Fällen geht es um den ersten Ruf im Frühling, der die Frage beantwortet, ob der Hörer das Jahr überlebt: „Ist der Kuckuck das erste Mal im Frühling im Westen [d.h. von Westen her] zu hören, dann stirbt man in dem Jahr nicht, denn die Stimme des Kuckucks weist gegen Sonnenaufgang; ist der Kuckuck das erste Mal gegen Osten zu hören [der Hörer nimmt ihn aus östlicher Richtung wahr, der Vogel ruft also in Richtung Westen], wird man im Lauf des Jahres sterben, da die Stimme gegen Sonnenuntergang weist."[41]

Nach einer Nachricht aus Gautsträsk (Sorsele) hängt die zu erwartende Dauer des Lebens von der Tageszeit ab, zu der man den Kuckuck zum ersten Mal gehört hat: War es am Vormittag, bedeutete das ein langes Leben, wenn es aber später am Tag war, dann würde man nicht lange leben (Ella Odstedt, 18704: 146, aufgezeichnet 1942). Hier wird die Tageszeit mit den Stadien des Lebens in eine Beziehung gesetzt.

## 8. Der Kuckucksbaum

Eine positive Begegnung mit dem Vogel kann unter dem Baum erfolgen, auf dem ein Kuckuck sitzt. Aus dem Norden des saamischen Traditionsgebietes gibt es hierzu nur wenige einschlägige Nachrichten. Bei Leem (1767: 504–505) ist nicht ausdrücklich von Wünschen und deren Erfüllung

---

wenn er im Frühjahr zum ersten Mal aus Südosten rief, weil das viel Butter für das Jahr versprach (Svanberg 2016: 56). In einer Aufzeichnung aus der Landgemeinde Mikkeli (Mikkelin pitäjä, von 1930) ist der aus dem Süden rufende Kuckuck ebenfalls der Vogel des Wachstums: *„Elonkäki etelästä, ilonkäki idästä, onnettoman luotehesta, varsin vaivaisen pohjasta"* ('Getreidekuckuck aus dem Süden, Freudenkuckuck aus dem Osten, des Unglücklichen aus dem Westen, des ganz Elenden aus dem Norden'; Järvinen 2005: 90).

41. Qvigstad hat diese etwas unklar formulierte Angabe, die eine christliche Vorstellung involviert, nicht übernommen. Helland fügt ihr hinzu, es sei eine saamische Zurechtlegung des norwegischen Glaubens: *„Vest – viljegauk, aust – giljegauk, sud – saagauk, nor – naagauk (= liggjøk)"* ('West – Willekuckuck, Ost – Freierkuckuck, Süd – Sä-Kuckuck, Nord – Leichen-Kuckuck'), in dem der Norden wieder die Richtung des Todes ist.

die Rede, bei ihm heißt es, die Lappen glaubten, man werde glücklich, wenn man unter einem Baum, auf dem ein Kuckuck rief, zu stehen gelangte, bevor dieser fortflog. Der einzige jüngere nördlichere Beleg stammt aus Balsfjord (südlich von Tromsø). Dort hat ein Volksschullehrer 1889 aufgezeichnet: „Wenn man sich unter einen Baum, wo der Kuckuck ruft, schleichen kann und drei Wünsche tut, ehe der Kuckuck wegfliegt, werden die Wünsche erfüllt" (Qvigstad 1920: 111, Nr. 373). Die Erfüllung dreier Wünsche entspricht einem in Schweden „sehr verbreiteten Volksglauben" (Tillhagen 1978: 172). Alle anderen saamischen Belege stammen weiter aus dem Süden, aus dem Gebiet von Lule- bis Åsele-Lappmark, wobei sich die Dreizahl – sofern eine Zahl genannt wird – aber nicht auf die Zahl der Wünsche, sondern auf die notwendige Handlung als Bedingung für die Erfüllbarkeit eines Wunsches bezieht. Von hier stammen auch saamische Benennungen für den Kuckucksbaum. Ella Odstedt hat in Gautsträsk, auf umesaamischem Gebiet, *„geäken muorra"* aufgezeichnet (ULMA 18704: 145), was auf eine Übernahme aus schwedischer Tradition schließen lässt.[42] Aus Vapsten (Åselegebiet) ist *„gekamuore"* belegt (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107).

In diesen südlicheren Gebieten besteht die Herausforderung darin, um den Baum herumzugehen. Grundström (1923: 48–49) hat von einem „Rentiernomaden" im lulesaamischen Jokkmokk (Sirkas) notiert, der Kuckuck sei ein scheuer Vogel, der nicht zu warten pflege, bis man um den Baum herumkomme, sondern bei einer Annäherung davonfliege. Einige aber lasse er so vier, fünf Mal herumgehen.

---

42. Saam. *muorra* 'Baum'; schwed. *gökträd*. SAOB gibt für *gökträd* (Stichwort *gök*) an, jetzt werde das Wort (in bestimmten Gegenden) nur noch bildlich verwendet, führt aber als Volksglauben der 1860er Jahre aus *Svenska fornminnesföreningens tidskrift* 11 (1901), 209 für Östergötland an: *Om man lyckas att slå armarna om gökträdet … och hinner uttala tre önskningar, under det att … (göken) gal, så får man dessa uppfyllda* ('Wenn es einem gelingt, die Arme um den Kuckucksbaum zu schlingen … und dazu kommt, drei Wünsche auszusprechen, während … (der Kuckuck) ruft, dann bekommt man diese erfüllt'). Ein weiteres Beispiel (finnlandschwedisch) stammt von Z. Topelius. Vgl. Klintberg 2010: 34, A53 *Under the cuckoo tree*. – Eine andere Gewährsperson von Odstedt aus Gautsträsk kannte keine saamische Benennung für den Baum.

In Arjeplog (Jäckvik) hat Kolmodin 1913 von einem Pitesaamen erfahren, dass man bekomme, was man sich wünsche, wenn man unter einen Baum gelangt, wo der Kuckuck sitzt, und drei Mal mit einem frischen Birkenzweig in der Hand um ihn geht (Kolmodin 1914: 7, Nr. 49). Der frische Zweig weist darauf, dass das Glück des Wünschenkönnens nur im Frühling zuteil wird. Deutlich wird das in einer Aufzeichnung von einem Waldsaamen (Umesaamen) aus Arvidsjaur, ebenfalls Pite-Lappmark, dass man drei Mal um den Kuckucksbaum herumgehen müsse, im Frühling, wenn der Kuckuck kommt (Brännström 2017: 200). Die einschlägigen Notizen von Ella Odstedt aus Gautsträsk in Sorsele künden, weniger detailliert, vom Glück, sich etwas wünschen zu können, wenn man um den Baum laufen kann, auf dem der Kuckuck sitzt (ULMA 18704: 152; auch Odstedt 2004: 52–53, Nr. 165), oder knapper, wenn man unter einen solchen Baum kommt (ULMA 18704: 145).[43] Odstedts diesbezügliche Aufzeichnungen stammen aus dem Jahr 1942 und haben ältere Personen als Quelle. Eine von ihnen, eine 1875 geborene Witwe, erinnerte sich, als Kind vergeblich unter den Baum mit dem Kuckuck zu gelangen versucht zu haben (ULMA 18704: 152, auch 2004, a. a. O.).

Auch aus dem umesaamischen Tärna liegt eine Nachricht von 1933 vom Kuckucksbaum vor, unter dem sitzend man sich etwas wünschen darf (Nils Eriksson, ULMA 6473a: 6–7). Erfolgreiches Wünschen gilt auch für Vapsten, wo man von einem, dem sein Vorhaben auf irgendeine Weise besonders gut gelinge, sage, dass er unter einem „*gekamuore*", Kuckucksbaum, gewesen sei (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107).

Unter einen Baum zu kommen und zudem diesen noch drei Mal zu umrunden, ohne dass der Vogel inzwischen davonfliegt, ist wahrlich ein Hindernis auf dem Weg zum Glück. Eine Kontamination von dem Verlangen nach Glück und der Frage nach der Lebenszeit mit der kaum weniger erfüllbaren Bedingung, einen Gürtel drei Mal um den Baum zu binden (!), findet sich in der Aussage einer 82-jährigen Saamin aus Gautsträsk (Sorsele), nach der die Dauer des Lebens daraus ersichtlich wird, ob der Baum welkt (baldiger Tod) oder grün stehen bleibt (langes Leben) (Ella

---

43. Eine entsprechende Mitteilung eines Enkels von Anders Fjellner (ULMA 18704: 149) spiegelt wohl schwedische Tradition wider. Dessen Mutter hatte einen Bauern geheiratet. Dem bäuerlichen schwedischen Milieu sind auch zwei andere Gewährspersonen mit entsprechender Nachricht zuzurechnen (ULMA 18704: 151).

Odstedt, ULMA 18704: 150, von 1942). Die ursprünglichere Vorstellung hat Odstedt (ebd. 145) von einem Saamen aus demselben Ort erfahren: Welkte der Kuckucksbaum, sollte der Mensch, der darunter saß, in naher Zukunft sterben. Anders als beim Biss in den Baum ist das Welken hier also kein Zeichen für eine positive Entwicklung.

Eine singuläre Angabe, nach der man unter dem Kuckucksbaum seine zukünftige Braut ersehen kann, stammt aus Jokkmokk (Sirkas): „Ich und Nils Kuoljok gingen so vier, fünf Mal um einen Kuckucksbaum herum, um reich zu werden und damit wir unsere (zukünftigen) Bräute sähen, die in der Richtung zu finden wären, in die der Kuckuck fliegen würde. Wir sagten nichts, aber als wir es überdrüssig wurden herum zu gehen, blieben wir stehen, setzten uns und sagten: »Flieg nun in die Richtung, wo unsere Bräute sind.« Da flog der Kuckuck nach Süden, und dort fanden sie sich auch." (Grundström 1923: 49.)[44]

## 9. Sonstiges Positives

Die Rolle des Kuckucks ist im Süden des saamischen Traditionsgebietes weniger negativ festgelegt als im Norden. Von hier stammt auch die Mehrzahl der Belege für den Kuckucksbaum, der Glück verspricht, auch wenn dieses Glück durch Erfüllung von Wünschen nur schwerlich zu erlangen ist.

Skoltsaamisch, aus Paatsjoki, ist die Aussage, dass der lange in dieselbe Richtung gehende Ruf des Kuckucks gute Beute verspricht (T. I. Itkonen 1931: 150; entsprechend 1946: 241; 1948 II: 370–371): „Wenn der Kuckuck lange in dieselbe Richtung ruft, wird ein Fangjahr." Glückbringend wird der Kuckuck auch dargestellt, wenn es heißt, er habe ein *leavvedolgi* 'Glücksfeder'. Aus dem lulesaamischen Kvikkjokk rührt die Angabe Nenséns (Drake 1918: 346) her, dass er eine solche Feder habe, die Glück in allem bedeutet. Diese einzelne Feder wird gewöhnlich nur dem Raben zugesprochen (z. B. Enontekiö, T. I. Itkonen 1946: 243; Ofoten, Qvigstad 1920: 113, Nr. 381c; Arjeplog, Jäckvik, Kolmodin 1914: 7, Nr. 50), bei Nensén (a. a. O.) auch dem Adler, nach einer Mitteilung von Qvigstad (1920: 113, Nr. 381a,

---

44. Die Frage nach der Braut weicht von den aus Schweden (und aus ganz Westeuropa) bekannten Liebesorakeln ab, in denen entsprechend der Frage nach der Länge des Lebens aus der Zahl der ku-kú-Rufe die Zahl der Jahre bis zur Hochzeit ersehen wird (Tillhagen 1978: 167–168).

von 1883) aus Kvänangen aber allen Raubvögeln. Der Rabe ist sehr schnell darin, Fressbares zu finden, und so vermag der Mann, der im Besitz dieser dem sterbenden Vogel abgenommenen Feder ist, auch besonders gut Beute aufzuspüren.

Glück bringt nach Leem (1767: 505) auch, ein Kuckucksei zu finden. Dieses aß man mit einem umgestülpten Kessel auf dem Kopf (zum Schutz gegen Angriffe aus der Luft). Anta Pirak hat Grundström erzählt: „Alte Menschen unterrichteten uns auch, dass wir, wenn ein Kuckuck aus einem Busch flog, nachschauen sollten, ob es dort Eier gebe. Wenn es wirklich welche gab, sollte man auf der Stelle ein Loch in die Schale klopfen, es roh austrinken und sagen: »Önsken önsken, ägg (Wünscht, wünscht, Eier)! Dass ich reich werde!« – und dann sollte man die Eierschale unter dem Busch zurücklassen. Dann wurde der Mensch reich, obwohl kaum jemand das Ei des Kuckucks hat finden können." (Grundström 1929: 73; auch Tillhagen 1978: 173; Fjellström 1986: 405.) Während das Ei des vor allem Unglück prophezeienden Kuckucks also, wenn auch nur in seltenen Fällen, Glück bringen konnte – wobei der zitierte Spruch den Wunsch angeblich von den Eiern ausgehen lässt –, war es umgekehrt ein Unglück, das Nest eines Unglückshähers zu finden, der doch für die Saamen ein Glücksvogel ist: Es bringt Schrecken und Verwirrung (Sodankylä, Vuotso, TKU 67/304).

Eine singuläre Angabe aus Vapsten im Åselegebiet stellt dar, dass weise Männer aus dem Ruf des Kuckucks heraushören können, ob die Rene in dem Jahr die Klauenseuche bekommen (Bäckman & Kjellström 1979: 107, aufgezeichnet ca. 1905). Um den Ruf deuten und sich damit den seherischen Fähigkeiten des Kuckucks als ebenbürtig erweisen zu können, bedarf der Mensch also ungewöhnlicher geistiger Fähigkeiten.

## 10. Der Kuckuck als Prophet für Wetter und Wachstum

Vögel gelten vielfach auch als „Wetterpropheten". Manche begegnen ausschließlich oder vor allem als solche, manche wenig oder gar nicht. Der so prominent als Omenvogel wirkende Kuckuck dient durch seinen Ruf oder durch sein Verhalten ebenfalls als Wetteromen, wenn auch die einschlägigen Fälle angesichts des reichen Gesamtmaterials und im Vergleich zu den Nachbartraditionen relativ wenige sind. Aus dem Norden Finnlands liegen einige hierher gehörige Angaben vor. Aus Inari heißt es, dass gutes, trockenes Wetter kommt, wenn der Kuckuck schön ruft (T. I. Itkonen

1948 II: 576), dass er aber Regen vorhersagt, wenn er sich räuspert oder würgt (weil er nicht rufen kann; Koskimies & Itkonen 1978: 410–411, von 1886; vgl. E. Itkonen 1986–1991 I: 382, Nr. 1709 *kovlođ*)[45]. Wenn er sich fort-während räuspert, sagt er nach den Rentiersaamen Inaris kalte Witterung voraus (T. I. Itkonen 1948 II: 578). Aus dem umesaamischen Gebiet, aus Gautsträsk (Sorsele) liegt von Ella Odstedt (ULMA 18704: 153; auch Od-stedt 2004: 53, Nr. 167, von 1942) von einem Informanten mit saamischen Eltern die Angabe vor, dass es ein schlechter Sommer und ein Jahr mit Missernte (*svagår*) werde, wenn der Kuckuck auf schwarzem Zweig rufe, d. h. vor Beginn einer wärmeren Zeit im Frühling.[46] Hier verbindet sich Wettervorhersage und ökonomische Prognose. Der schwarze Zweig steht in Kontrast zu dem grünenden (Birken-)Zweig, der Abhilfe gegen den Vogelbetrug verspricht, der ja auch die wirtschaftliche Situation beeinflus-sen kann. Eine einzelne Nachricht aus dem südsaamischen Røros (Bergs-land 1943: 314–315; 1987: 89, von 1941) nennt den Ruf des Kuckucks nahe dem Haus Anzeichen eines Unwetters (vgl. 4).

---

45. Vgl. oben *poahčánaddađ* im Abschnitt 3. Der sog. Vogelbetrug. Nach Aus-weis des Inarilappischen Wörterbuches werden auch mit diesem Verb wie mit *kovlođ* die Laute wiedergegeben, mit denen der Vogel kaltes Wetter ankündigt. Als Beispiele werden angeführt: (östliche Mundart) *kieha poahčánad, ij pyehti kukkad* 'der Kuckuck erstickt, er kann nicht mehr rufen (so ist es angeblich vor kaltem Wetter)', (südliche Mundart) *kieha poahčánad, te poatá čoaskim* 'der Kuckuck erstickt, es wird kaltes Wetter' (E. Itkonen 1986–1991 II: 375). Die Belege für *kovlođ* entstammen denselben Mundarten: (östlich) *kieha kovlo* 'der Kuckuck räuspert sich od. würgt (weil er nicht rufen kann)', (südlich) *kieha kovlo, te poatá nieyris šoŋŋa* 'der Kuckuck würgt, es wird schlechtes Wetter'.

46. Von einer Bauerntochter in Gautsträsk hat Odstedt (ULMA 18704: 151; auch Odstedt 2004: 53, Nr. 168) Entsprechendes aufgezeichnet: „Wenn der Kuckuck auf einem kahlen [d. h. noch nicht grünen] Ast ruft, wenn er kommt, dann wird es ein kalter und schlechter Sommer werden." Hammarin (1990: 81) bringt aus Jämtland eine Reihe von Belegen für diese Auffassung. Nach Till-hagen (1978: 170–171, Unterkapitel „Der Kuckuck und das Jahreswachstum") ist diese Vorhersage die allgemeine, während aus dem Süden Schwedens die auch für Norwegen belegte Auffassung angeführt wird, dass der Ruf auf un-belaubtem Zweig ein gutes Jahr voraussage. Zuvor hat Tillhagen (170) aus der schwedischen Tradition einiges für den Kuckuck als Wetterpropheten angeführt; Verhalten oder Art des Rufes verkünden demnach überwiegend Regen.

## 11. Zum Schluss

Im Obigen sind die Glaubensvorstellungen der Saamen hinsichtlich des Kuckucks auf der Grundlage des ausgewerteten Materials detailliert behandelt worden. Ein wesentlicher Grund für die umfassende Darstellung ist, eine breite Basis für Vergleiche mit den Vorstellungen zu anderen Vögeln zu bieten, unter allgemeinen oder speziellen thematischen Gesichtspunkten (vgl. Bartens, im Druck). Alle saamischen Gebiete sollten, soweit das entsprechende Material zur Verfügung stand, gleichberechtigt präsentiert werden. Neben der räumlichen Dimension sollte auch die zeitliche Berücksichtigung finden, soweit die Quellenlage es eben zuließ. Auch Glaubensvorstellungen unterliegen einem Wandel, weshalb hier, um die Zeitgebundenheit wenigstens anzudeuten, Jahreszahlen für die jeweilige Aufzeichnung angegeben sind. Die ausgewerteten Daten entstammen rund zwei Jahrhunderten. Die Angabe, von wann sie herrühren, ist besonders dann angezeigt, wenn es sich um Archivmaterialien handelt oder zwischen Aufzeichnung und Publikation eine größere Zeitspanne liegt.

Es war hier nicht das Anliegen, ein Bild von „ursprünglichen" Vorstellungen zu entwerfen; auch solche Angaben, die ein Verblassen oder eine Vermischung erkennen lassen, wurden berücksichtigt. Wie die Glaubensvorstellungen heute beschaffen sind und was sich gewandelt hat, lässt sich anhand der Materialien erkennen, die im Rahmen des Turkuer Talvadas-Projekts durch Tonbandaufnahmen gesammelt worden sind. Diese Aufnahmen sind schwerpunktmäßig in Utsjoki – und hier besonders im Dorf Talvadas –, ferner unter den übrigen Nord- sowie den Inarisaamen in Nordfinnland und in den unmittelbar angrenzenden Gebieten gemacht worden. Das Projekt wurde nach Vorarbeiten 1967 begonnen. Aus technischen Gründen war es Verfasser nur möglich, etwa die Hälfte der Inhaltsangaben (und Tonbandprotokolle) für die Tonbänder im Internet einzusehen (Omina insgesamt sind auf mehr als 200 Tonbändern festgehalten worden), aber es ergibt sich doch schon hieraus ein Bild. Der Kuckuck ist der prominenteste Omenvogel, er ist ein Vogel, der Unglück (*guoržžu*) bringt[47] und hier vor allem den Tod vorhersagt.[48] Dass er ein

---

47. *guoržžu* '1. Unglücksprophet, Unglücksvogel, Unheilstifter, Unglücksbringer; 2. Unglück, Missgeschick, Pech' (Sammallahti & Nickel 2006 s. v.). „*guoržžu* bedeutet Unglück" erläutert auch ein Informant aus Talvadas (TKU 70/75).

48. Z. B. „Der Kuckuck ist ein Zugvogel, das Kuckucken prophezeit schlechte Ereignisse, Tod" (TKU 67/53, Talvadas).

Zaubervogel ist, kann als alte Auffassung charakterisiert werden („früher sagte man", TKU 67/131, Talvadas) oder als nicht glaubwürdig bezeichnet werden (TKU 67/124). Dass er „bescheißt", wird weniger erwähnt (so TKU 67/127, 70/75), deutlich häufiger das Erscheinen des Vogels in der Nähe von Behausungen. Auch die Farbe der Füße – hier gelb – als Vorzeichen wird genannt.[49] Dass Vorstellungen im Wandel sind, zeigt sich z. B. an der Frage, ob man einen Kuckuck schießen darf und kann.

Die Daten aus dem Talvadas-Projekt erweisen, dass das Wissen um alte Glaubensvorstellungen zum Kuckuck – ob man sie denn weiterhin gelten lässt oder nicht – im zentralen saamischen Traditionsgebiet noch recht lebendig ist, wohingegen einige Aussagen oder Anmerkungen aus südlicheren Gebieten auf ein Verblassen schon in den Jahren um 1930–1940 herum zu deuten scheinen.

Die saamische Tradition zum Kuckuck enthält viele Vorstellungen, die denen der Nachbarkulturen und darüber hinaus mehr oder weniger entsprechen. Besonders augenfällig ist hier die Vorstellung vom Vogelbetrug, die die saamische Tradition nicht nur in einen skandinavischen[50] und finnischen, sondern in einen europäischen Zusammenhang einbindet, wenngleich aus der russischen Tradition nur wenige Belege vorliegen (Nyman 1953: 3–26[51]). Wenn von den östlichsten Saamen nichts Entsprechendes anzuführen gewesen ist, so steht das damit im Einklang. Worin sich die saamischen Traditionen zum Kuckuck von denen ihrer Nachbarn unterscheiden – was systematisch zu verfolgen hier nicht die Absicht war –, liegt vor allem in der unterschiedlichen Gewichtung einzelner Elemente. Bei den meisten Nachrichten zum Kuckuck handelt es

---

49. Einige Nennungen gehen auf dieselbe Gewährsperson zurück; in Talvadas wurden alle Bewohner, die älter als 18 Jahre waren, bewusst mehrmals von verschiedenen Personen interviewt. – Was die Farbsymbolik anbelangt, wird mehrfach schwarz als Farbe eines nicht nach seiner Art bestimmten Vogels als Vorzeichen für den Tod erwähnt. Schon Paulaharju hat 1926 von einem schwarzen Vogel gehört, der zur Kirche hin flog. Der Mann und die Frau, die ihn bei der Heuarbeit gesehen hatten, vermuteten sofort, dass einer von ihnen im nächsten Winter nicht mehr am Leben sein werde. Der Mann starb, seine Frau wurde krank. (SKS KRA Paulaharju, S. b) 13920. 1930.)

50. Schon Lindahl und Öhrling (1780: 112; 2015: 226) fügen in ihrem Artikel *Lådde* dem *låddist paikatallet* hinzu: „på svenska: dåras af fåglar: unde Svecos eadem occupatos fuisse superstitione facilis est conclusio."

51. Belege aus Russland – nach D. K. Zelenin –, darunter auch einer von den Udmurten, s. Nyman (1953: 24–26).

sich um Mitteilungen von Glaubensvorstellungen, nur selten sind diese Teil einer Erzählung. Sagen, wie sie aus dem Schwedischen für die drei Wünsche unter dem Kuckucksbaum vorliegen, finden sich nicht darunter. Tillhagen (1978: 172) führt zwei schwedische Belege für den bereits erwähnten Typ Klintberg A53 an.[52] Für Sagen zur Entstehung des Kuckucks, die Röhrich (1996: 545) in seinem Enzyklopädie-Artikel zahlreich nennt, hat oben nur ein Beleg aus Jokkmokk vorgelegt werden können. Tillhagen (1978: 157–158) bringt zahlreiche einschlägige Beispiele aus verschiedenen Traditionen, u. a. eine „alte Mythe" aus dem südnorwegischen Mandal. Erzählungen, die die Stimme des Vogels deuten und derer es nach Röhrich (1996: 545–546) ebenfalls viele gibt, finden sich in meinem saamischen Material nicht, allerdings führt auch Tillhagen in seinem Abschnitt „Der Name des Kuckucks" (1978: 160–161) keine Erzählung aus Skandinavien an. Erzählerisch thematisiert wird auch nicht, weshalb der Kuckuck nur eine bestimmte Zeit des Jahres ruft. Auch für ein so spezielles Verbot, vor dem ersten Ruf des Kuckucks Fleisch, das roh, nur geräuchert, gepökelt ist, zu essen – wofür B. Egardt (1957) auch den Hintergrund beleuchtet –, bietet das ausgewertete saamische Material keine Parallele. Andererseits spielt die Farbe der Füße bei den skandinavischen Nachbarn keine Rolle.

Auffällig bei einem Vergleich der Überlieferungen ist, dass der Kuckuck bei den Saamen vor allem eine Gefahr darstellt. Der Kuckucksbaum vertritt zwar eine positive Möglichkeit der Begegnung, doch diesbezügliche Überlieferungen sind weniger zahlreich und die Aussicht auf eine glückliche Begegnung ist nicht sehr groß. Aus dem nordsaamischen Gebiet liegen nur einzelne einschlägige Angaben vor. Die von Leem zeigt allerdings, dass eine entsprechende Vorstellung unter den Saamen dort schon alt ist. Der Kuckuck tritt nur wenig als ein nach der Starre des Winters erscheinender Verkünder eines neuen, unbeschwerteren Lebens auf. Einen Neuanfang in der Natur benennen nach dem Kuckuck benannte

---

52. Einen weiteren Typ bildet Klintberg R122 *Moving hibernating cuckoo*, der im Saamischen offenbar keine Entsprechung hat. – Im Sachregister von Jauhiainen (1998) findet sich kein Stichwort *cuckoo*, was darauf hinweisen könnte, dass in der finnischen Überlieferung zum Kuckuck Erzähltexte fehlen. Järvinen (2005: 84) führt jedoch aus verschiedenen Gegenden des finnischen Sprachgebietes einiges an, was die kurze Zeit des Kuckucksrufes sowie das Aussehen des Vogels erklärt und bei aller Kürze erzählerischen Charakter hat.

Pflanzen, wofür es auch im Saamischen Belege gibt, wie z. B. nordsaam. *gieganjuollas ~ gieganjuolla* 'Maiglöckchen' oder umesaam. (Sorsele) „geäken-gella" (Ella Odstedt, ULMA 18704: 145), „die zeitig im Frühling auf Fjällmooren kommt" (vgl. schwed. *gök-klocka*, *gök-skälla* 'Frühlings-Kuhschelle, Frühlings-Küchenschelle [*Pulsatilla verrnalis*]', SAOB). Für die Rene verkündet der Kuckuck weiteres Leben, wenn es bei den Rentiersaamen in Inari heißt: „Wenn ein junges Renntier im Frühjahr den Kuckucksruf hört, stirbt es nicht, so schwach es auch sei" (T. I. Itkonen 1946: 239). Entsprechend (wohl Skoltsaamen): „Wenn ein Renkalb im Frühling den Kuckucksruf hört, stirbt es nicht, auch wenn es in sehr schwachem Zustand sein sollte" (T. I. Itkonen 1948 II: 370). Und die entscheidende Schwelle stellt der Kuckucksruf auch dar, wenn sich die Fischersaamen von Inari angesichts eines im Frühjahr ausgehungerten Rens fragen: „Wird es noch den Kuckucksruf hören?" Auch für den Menschen ist nach Auffassung der Skoltsaamen von Paatsjoki der Ruf eine Schwelle, die man erreichen muss, wenn, wie oben gesagt, dem Menschen nichts Gutes bevorsteht, wenn er lange nicht den Kuckuck gehört hat. Entsprechend heißt es ganz am anderen Ende des Traditionsgebietes, in Røros, es bedeute Unglück, den Kuckuck in einem Jahr gar nicht zu hören (3.1), wodurch eine jahreszeitlich nicht begrenzte magische Verbundenheit des Menschen mit dem Kuckuck zum Ausdruck kommt; die hier auf verschiedene Abschnitte verteilten skoltsaamischen Belege heben allgemein nicht auf den ersten Ruf im Frühling ab.

Der in einer Übergangszeit ertönende Ruf des Kuckucks stellt zwar, so Nyman (s. oben unter 3.1), eine Gefährdung dar, doch bis zu diesem Übergang muss man gelangen, um eine neue Phase erreichen zu können. Insofern bedeutet der Ruf neben Gefahr zugleich auch die Möglichkeit einer positiven Entwicklung. Auf einen Neuanfang für die Psyche des Menschen verweist der Ruf des Vogels, wenn, wie Itkonen anführt, es den Greisen erscheine, „als würden beim Kuckucksruf 'alle alten Sünden vergeben'" (T. I. Itkonen 1948 II: 370). Doch Letzteres ist eine Ausnahme, die immerhin aus dem nördlichen Traditionsgebiet stammt, wo der Kuckuck mehr als anderweitig ein Verkünder des Todes ist – den es abzuwenden gilt –, während sich sein Bild nach Süden zu insgesamt aufhellt.

Das gesamte saamische Traditionsgebiet verbindet, dass von der extremen Verkündung des Todes abgesehen in den Fällen, in denen aus der Begegnung von Kuckuck und Mensch ein Schaden entsteht, dieser oft einen unmittelbaren Zusammenhang mit der Lebenserwerbsform, der

täglichen Arbeit der Menschen aufweist. Gleichwohl lassen sich innerhalb des saamischen Traditionsgebietes Unterschiede erkennen, auch wenn ein Vergleich zwischen den einzelnen saamischen Gruppen dadurch einigermaßen erschwert wird, dass die Quellenlage unterschiedlich gut ist. Dass die östlichsten Saamen hier nicht vertreten waren, ist sicherlich dem Fehlen einer entsprechenden Tradition zuzuschreiben. In anderen Gebieten hängt die Datenmenge aber offenbar auch von dem Interesse einzelner Sammler an Vögeln und den mit ihnen zusammenhängenden Omina ab. Allerdings muss auch mit dem Verlust einer einschlägigen Tradition gerechnet werden. Die beiden pitesaamischen Angaben, die im Obigen angeführt (3.1 und 8) und 1913 von Kolmodin aufgezeichnet worden sind, stammen von nur einer Gewährsperson. Die Waldsaamen (Umesaamen) aus der Pite-Lappmark – und die Umesaamen überhaupt – haben offensichtlich aber zumindest in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts mehr einschlägiges Wissen bewahrt gehabt. Das gilt nicht nur für den Kuckuck, sondern für das Wissen um Omina allgemein (vgl. Bartens 2020, 14–18). Was die skoltsaamischen Vorstellungen anbelangt, möchte man von Entlehnungen ausgehen. Leider fehlen bei der Mehrzahl der Belege präzise Ortsangaben; sind sie gegeben, wird Paatsjoki genannt.

Verbreitet unter den Saamen in dem hier in Rede stehenden Traditionsgebiet ist die Vorstellung vom Vogelbetrug und vom Vogelbissen (5.1) als dessen Abwehr. Der regionale Nachweis des Vogelbetrugs selbst (3.1) und seiner Auswirkungen (3.2) im Material ist nicht ganz identisch, doch setzt Letzteres ja Ersteres voraus und kann deshalb zugleich auch als dessen Nachweis gelten (für Skoltsaamisch und Jämtland). In 3.2 zeigen sich regionale Unterschiede, wie bereits gesagt, darin, dass der Ruf im Norden, auch nach einer Nachricht von den Skoltsaamen, als eine der Folgen den Tod bewirken kann, eine Auffassung, die – wie etwas weiter oben gesagt worden ist – noch immer gilt. Für das Åselegebiet ist als besondere Folge das Verwelken zu nennen. Der Biss in Rinde und Zweig (5.2) ist vor allem aus dem nordsaamischen Gebiet belegt, was auf finnischen Einfluss deutet. Die vereinzelte und regional isoliert wirkende Nachricht aus Vapsten in der Åsele-Lappmark schließt sich aber jenen Angaben aus dem Norden an, in denen vom Verdorren des Baumes die Rede ist.

Für den Norden des saamischen Traditionsgebietes ist als Besonderheit zu nennen, dass bestimmte Faktoren bei der Deutung und Bedeutung des Kuckucksrufes eine Rolle spielen. Nach zwei Mitteilungen sind Heiserkeit (wohl Utsjoki) oder ein an ein Ersticken erinnernder Ruf (inarisaam.)

die Anzeichen für Lebensgefahr (3.1). Ein erstickendes Rufen oder Räuspern sagt nach Angaben aus Inari (10, Inarisaamen und Bergsaamen) auch schlechtes Wetter vorher, Regen bzw. Kälte. Auch sonst (umesaam., jämtlandsaam.) werden besondere Umstände genannt, unter denen der Kuckuck ungünstiges Wetter ankündigt.

In Verbindung mit der Länge des Lebens (7) ist im Nordsaamischen von Bedeutung, aus welcher Himmelsrichtung der Vogel ruft. Der Süden als positive Himmelsrichtung begegnet auch in einer Nachricht aus dem ebenfalls nordsaamischen Polmak (5.2): Hier gilt es zur nachträglichen Abwehr des Schadens den Birkenbaum auf der Südseite abzunagen. Die Position von Mensch und Vogel spielt auch in einer Mitteilung aus Vapsten im Åselegebiet eine Rolle (3.1).

Eine regionale Gliederung des saamischen Traditionsgebietes lässt sich anhand der Kuckucktradition nur begrenzt erkennen, was teilweise der unterschiedlichen Quellenlage zuzuschreiben ist. Deutlicher wird eine Grenze zwischen dem nordsaamischen und dem südlicheren Gebiet, die zumindest teilweise auf Einflüsse seitens der unmittelbar benachbarten Traditionen, der finnischen bzw. skandinavischen, zurückzuführen ist. Eine Ausweitung der Untersuchung auf alle Omenvögel könnte präzisere Ergebnisse erbringen und wäre somit eine Aufgabe.

## Ungedruckte Quellen

NFS = Norsk Folkeminnesamling, Institutt for kulturstudier og orientaliske språk, Universität Oslo. Manuskripte von J. Qvigstad [Q].

SKS KRA = Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Kansanrunousarkisto, jetzt Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran arkisto, perinteen ja nykykulttuurin kokoelma. Helsinki.

TKU = Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen arkistot, TKU-kokoelma, Talvadas. Turun yliopisto.

ULMA = Landsmåls- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala, heute in Institutet för språk och folkminnen: Dialekt- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala.

## Literatur

Bäckman, Louise & Kjellström, Rolf (Hrsg.). 1979. *Kristoffer Sjulssons minnen om Vapstenlapparna i början af 1800-talet*, upptecknade af O. P. Pettersson (Acta Lapponica 20). Stockholm.

Barruk, Henrik. 2018. *Báhkuogirjjie: Ubmejesámien–dáruon, dáruon–ubmejesámien = Ordbok: Umesamisk-svensk, svensk-umesamisk.* [Gagnef:] Kanaanstiftelsen i Sverige.

Bartens, Hans-Hermann. 2020. *Die Erzähltraditionen der Pite- und Umesaamen.* (Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 41.) Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-434078

Bartens, Hans-Hermann. Im Druck. Vögel als Vorboten des Todes in der saamischen Tradition. *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 29.

Bergsland, Knut. 1943. *Røros-samiske tekster* (Nordnorske samlinger utgitt av Etnografisk museum II. Bidrag til finnernes bygdehistorie og etnografie, 3. hefte). Oslo: Brøgger.

Bergsland, Knut. 1987. *Gåebrehki soptsesh (Røros-samiske tekster).* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bergsland, Knut & Magga, Lajla Mattsson. 2007. *Åarjelsaemien–daaroen baakoegærja = Sydsamisk–norsk ordbok.* 2. Aufl. [Indre Billefjord]: Idut.

Brännström, Edvin. 1929. Något om fåglar i Norrbotten, som bringa lycka, olycka och död. *Norrbotten: Norrbottens läns hembygdsförenings tidskrift* 151–167.

Brännström 2017 = *Samiskt liv i äldre tid.* Edvin Brännströms uppteckningar från Arvidsjaur och Arjeplog, redigerade av Ivan Eriksson med språkliga kommentarer av Olavi Korhonen (Acta Academiae Regiae Gustavi Adolphi CXLV). Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien.

Demant-Hatt, Emilie. 1913. *Med lapperne i højfjeldet* (Lapparne og deras land II). Stockholm: Nordiska bokhandeln.
https://archive.org/details/medlapperneihjoodema

Drake, Sigrid. 1918 [1979]. *Västerbottenslapparna under förra hälften av 1800-talet.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. (Faksimilenachdruck Umeå: Två Förläggare 1979.)

Egardt, Brita. 1957. Spickeskinkan, göken och apostlagärningarna. *Rig* 40:2, 53–57.

Fellman, Jacob. 1906. *Anteckningar under min vistelse i Lappmarken.* I–III. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratursällskap.

Fjellström, Phebe. 1986. *Samernas samhälle i tradition och nutid.* 2. Aufl. Stockholm: Norstedt.

Grundström, H. 1923, 1929. Sägner och folktro bland lappar och nybyggare i Jokkmokk. *Norrbotten: Norrbottens läns hembygdsförenings årsbok* 1923, 37–54; 1929, 55–75.

Grundström, Harald. 1942. Tro och övertro bland lapparna. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* 65, 5–30.

GRUNDSTRÖM, HARALD. 1946–1954. *Lulelapsk ordbok – Lulelappisches Wörterbuch*. I–IV (Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmåls- och Folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala. Ser C: 1). Uppsala: Lundequist – København: Munksgaard.

GRUNDSTRÖM, HARALD. 1950. Folklig tideräkning i Lule lappmark. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* 73, 47–62.

HAMMARIN, LARS. 1987. *Fågeltro i Härjedalen*. [Krokom:] Jämtlands läns ornitologiska förening (JORF).

HAMMARIN, LARS. 1990. *Fågeltro i Jämtländ*. [Östersund:] Jämtlands läns ornitologiska förening (JORF).

HARVA, UNO. 1937. Volkstümliche Zeitrechnung im eigentlichen Finnland. *Folkliv* 1, 65–88.

HAUTALA, JOUKO. 1957. „Der Kuckuck bringt die Botschaft des Sommers". *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 59,2, 1–30.

HdA = *Handwörterbuch des Aberglaubens*. Hrsg. von Hanns Bächtold-Stäubli unter Mitwirkung von Eduard Hoffmann-Krayer. 1–10. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter 1987. (Nachdruck der Ausgabe Berlin – Leipzig: de Gruyter 1927–1942.)

HELLAND, AMUND. 1906 (auf Umschlag: 1905). *Topografisk-statistik beskrivelse over Finmarks Amt. II. Befolkning og historie* (Norges land og Folk, XX). Kristiania: Aschehoug.

ITKONEN, ERKKI. 1986–1991 = *Inarilappisches Wörterbuch*. Herausgegeben von Erkki Itkonen unter Mitarbeit von Raija Bartens und Lea Laitinen. I–IV (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XX). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

ITKONEN, TERHO. 1971. Uskomus-, tarina- ja satuaineistoa Tenon varresta. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 71,5, 1–84.

ITKONEN, T. I. 1931. *Koltan- ja kuolanlappalaisia satuja* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrinne LX). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

ITKONEN, T. I. 1946. *Heidnische Religion und späterer Aberglaube bei den finnischen Lappen* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXXVII). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

ITKONEN, T. I. 1948. *Suomen lappalaiset vuoteen 1945*. Helsinki: Söderström. I–II. (2. Aufl. 1984.)

JAUHIAINEN, MARJATTA. 1998. *The Type and Motif Index of Finnish Belief Legends and Memorates* (FF Communications 267). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

JÄRVINEN, IRMA-RIITTA (Hrsg.). 2005. *Pieni lintukirja: Suomalaista kansanperinnettä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

KINTEL, ANDERS. 2012. *Julevsáme-dárro báhkogirjje*.
http://gtweb.uit.no/webdict/ak/smj2nob

KLINTBERG, BENGT AF. 2010. *The Types of the Swedish Folk Legend* (FF Communications 300). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

KOLMODIN, TORSTEN. 1914. *Folktro, seder och sägner från Pite Lappmark* (Lapparne och deras land III). Stockholm: Nordiska bokhandeln.

KOSKIMIES, A. V. & ITKONEN, T. I. 1978. *Inarinlappalaista kansantietoutta*. 2., uudistettu painos. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 167). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. (1. Auf. 1917.)

Laestadius, Lars Levi. 2011. *Lappalaisten mytologian katkelmia* (Tietolipas 231). Toim. Juha Pentikäinen ja Risto Pulkkinen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Leem, Knud. 1767. *Beskrivelse over Finmarkens Lapper, deres Tungemaal, Levemaade og forrige Afgudsdyrkelse.* Kiøbenhavn: Trykt udi det Kongel. Wäysenhuses Bogtrykerie. (Faksimilenachdruck København: Rosenkilde & Bagger 1975.)

Lindahl, Ericus & Öhrling, Johannes. 1780. *Lexicon Lapponicum.* Holmiae. (2015 digitalisiert von Gudrun Norstedt, http://www.raamesuenne.se/Lexicon_lapponicum_20150309.pdf)

Magga, Lajla Mattsson. 2009. *Norsk–sydsamisk ordbok – Daaroen–åarjelsaemien baakoegærja.* [Indre Billefjord]: Idut.

Morottaja, Matti. 1996 (auf Umschlag: 1997). *Tovlááh mainâseh.* Aanaar: Anarâškielâ servi.

Nielsen, Konrad. 1932–1962. *Lappisk ordbok = Lapp Dictionary.* I–V (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning: Ser. B: XVII$_{1-5}$). Oslo: Aschehoug, (V:) Universitetsforlaget. (2. Aufl. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget 1979.)

Nyman, Åsa. 1953. Dårfåglar: Ett bidrag till de folkliga föreställningarna om vissa fåglars skadliga inverkan på människorna. *Arv: Tidskrift för Nordisk Folkminnesforskning* 9, 1–64.

Odstedt, Ella. 2004. *Norrländsk folktradition.* Uppteckningar i urval och med kommentar av Bengt af Klintberg. (Acta Academiae Regiae Gustavi Adolphi LXXXIV). Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien.

Ojanen, Eero & Ulv, Daga. 2015. *Suomen myyttiset linnut.* Koonnut ja muistiin merkinnyt Eero Ojanen. Kuvittanut Daga Ulv. Helsinki: Minerva.

Ostrovskij, D. N. 1889. Lopari i ich predanija. *Izvestija Imperatorskago Russkago Geografičeskago Obščestva.* Tom XXV, 316–332.

Paulaharju, Samuli. 1921. *Kolttain mailta. Kansatieteellisiä kuvauksia Kuollan-Lapista.* Helsinki: Kirja. (Neuauflage Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 2009; auch: https://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/59678/1921_f436681.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

Qvigstad, J. 1920. *Lappischer Aberglaube.* Kristiania: Brøgger. (Kristiania Etnografiske Museums skrifter 1,2, 41–135.)

Qvigstad, J. 1925. *Lappische Märchen- und Sagenvarianten* (FF Communications 60). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Qvigstad, J. 1927. *Lappiske eventyr og sagn.* I. *Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Varanger* (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Ser. B: III). Oslo: Aschehoug.

Qvigstad, J. & Sandberg, G. 1887. *Lappiske eventyr og folkesagn.* Kristiania.

Röhrich, Lutz. 1996. Kuckuck. In *Enzyklopädie des Märchens.* Bd. 8. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter. 543–548.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1975. *Sodankylän saamelaisten entistä elämää Elsa-Marja Aikion kertomana* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 14). Helsinki.

Sammallahti, Pekka & Nickel, Klaus Peter. 2006. *Sámi-duiskka sátnegirji = Saamisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch.* Karasjok: Davvi Girji.

SAOB = *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*. https://www.saob.se/

Spiik, Nils Eric. 1994. *Lulesamisk ordbok: Svensk-samisk*. Jokkmokk: Sameskol-styrelsen.

Storå, Nils. 1971. *Burial Customs of the Skolt Lapps* (FF Communications 210). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Svanberg, Ingvar. 2016. *Fåglar i svensk folklig tradition*. 2. Aufl. Stockholm: Dialogus.

Tillhagen, Carl-Herman. 1978. *Fåglarna i Folktron*. Stockholm: LTs förlag.

Tomasson, Torkel. 1988. *Några sägner, seder och bruk, upptecknade efter lapparna i Åsele- och Lycksele Lappmark samt Herjedalen sommaren 1917*. Red. av Leif Lindin och Håkan Rydving. (Skrifter utgivna genom Dialekt- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala. Ser. C: 5.) Uppsala.

Turi, Johan. 1992. *Erzählung vom Leben der Lappen*. Überliefert von Emilie Demant und aus dem Dänischen übersetzt von Mathilde Mann. Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn. (Die andere Bibliothek. Extradruck 2014.)

Turi, Johan. 2010. *Muitalus sámiid birra*. Doaimmahan Mikael Svonni Johan Turi giehtačállosa vuođul (SÁMIacademica 3). Karasjok: ČálliidLágádus.

Varonen, Matti. 1891 [2011]. *Suomen kansan muinaisia taikoja: 1. Metsästys-Taikoja*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Vilkuna, Kustaa. 1929. Käen ym. muuttolintujen pilauksesta. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 9, 110–117.

Wiklund, K. B. 1906. Fågelbit och „gök". *Språk och stil: Tidskrift för svensk språkforskning* 6, 249–251.

Wilbur, Joshua (Hrsg.). 2016. *Pitesamisk ordbok samt stavningsregler* (Samica 2). Freiburg: Department of Scandinavian Studies, University of Freiburg.

*Christopher Culver*
Cluj-Napoca

# Some details of Mari historical phonology

Mari historical phonology was broadly worked out during the twentieth century and summarized in classic works by Gruzov and Bereczki. Nevertheless, subsequent Uralic and Mari reconstructions were published with ramifications for historical phonology, and a vast trove of new data appeared in Mari dialectal dictionaries published since the turn of the millennium. The article examines four aspects of Mari historical phonology where this newly available data either leads us to posit new reconstructions at the Proto-Mari stage, or supports or overturns reconstructions published elsewhere: 1) Eastern Mari evidence for Ante Aikio's reconstruction of Proto-Mari reduced labial vowels; 2) regular lowering of *i before sonorants in Eastern Mari and irregularities sometimes suggesting that a vowel other than *i must be reconstructed; 3) palatalized *ŕ* in the Krasnoufimsk dialect and the environment for this palatalization; and 4) the reconstruction of all three possible voiced sibilant + velar clusters in Proto-Mari, i.e. *-zγ-, *-žγ- and *-źγ-. Additionally, a loan etymology of Mari *užγar* 'tool' from Alanic *zγar 'metal object' (cf. Ossetic *zγär* id.) is proposed.

## 1. Introduction

While Mari historical phonology was broadly worked out during the twentieth century and summarized in works by Gruzov (1969) and Bereczki (1992; 1994), since that time new Uralic and Mari reconstructions have been published with ramifications for historical phonology (e.g. Aikio 2014a; Metsäranta 2020), as well as a vast trove of new dialectal data from the dictionaries of Beke and Veršinin and *Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch*. The article examines four aspects of Mari historical phonology where this newly available data leads us to posit new reconstructions at the Proto-Mari stage, or either supports or overturns reconstructions published elsewhere. Section 2 presents Eastern Mari evidence for Aikio's reconstruction of Proto-Mari reduced labial vowels. Section 3 examines regular lowering of *i before sonorants in Eastern Mari and irregularities sometimes suggesting that a vowel other than *i must be reconstructed. In Section 4 palatalized *ŕ* in the Krasnoufimsk dialect and the environment for this palatalization is described. Finally, Section 5 reconstructs all three possible voiced sibilant + velar clusters for Proto-Mari, i.e. *-zγ-, *-žγ- and *-źγ-. Additionally, a loan etymology of Mari *užγar* 'tool' from Alanic *zγar 'metal object' (cf. Ossetic *zγär* id.) is proposed.[1]

## 2. Eastern Mari evidence for the reconstruction of Proto-Mari reduced labial vowels

Recent decades have seen two competing hypotheses on the history of the labial reduced vowels *ŭ* and *ü̆* in the Mari dialects. Gábor Bereczki (1994: 65ff.) did not reconstruct the labial reduced vowels for the Proto-Mari stage, instead he believed that they represent a later development. His hypothesis has been continued by Agyagási (2019), who views the reduced labial vowels as a post-Proto-Mari development which took place under the influence of Chuvash and affected only Hill Mari, Northwestern Mari and the Upša dialect of Meadow Mari (a grouping of dialects which I shall refer to as the "Western Complex").

However, Aikio (2014a) noted a number of irregularities in the Bereczki reconstruction and attempted to put the reconstruction of Mari historical vocalism on a firmer Neogrammarian footing. In Aikio's view, already in the Proto-Mari era there existed an opposition between full *u and *ü and reduced *ŭ and *ǚ, respectively. His key insight is that *ü and *ǚ can be traced back to different sources in Proto-Uralic: where *ü* is a full vowel across the Mari dialects it goes back to PU *ï or *ä, while the counterpart front labial vowel that appears as reduced in various Mari dialects goes back to PU *ü, *i, or *e.

Aikio's use of strict sound laws is already sufficient to make his reconstruction more convincing than Bereczki's. The later work by Agyagási (2019) fails to take into account Aikio's argument on different Proto-Uralic sources for the front labial vowels, and exceptions are readily found for the conditioning environments which Agyagási proposes for the reduction of the single original front labial vowel. Therefore, Agyagási's reconstruction suffers from the same flaw as Bereczki's.

We may in fact find further proof for Aikio's reconstruction of Proto-Mari front labial reduced vowels in some hitherto overlooked data from Eastern Mari. Bereczki and Agyagási drew mainly on the range of dialects found in Beke's (1997) dictionary (hereinafter referred to simply as Beke), while Aikio's paper relied on the material in *Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch* (TschWb). However, Veršinin (2011) has published a dictionary of Mari dialects of Tatarstan and Udmurtia that were not previously documented in either Beke or TschWb. Two of those dialects, namely the Menzelinsk dialect (Me) and the Bol'šaja Šija dialect (Ši), strikingly feature reduced vowels. In fact, the existence of reduced labial vowels in the Menzelinsk dialect has been known since Isanbaev (1964).[2]

If we extend Aikio's data on the interdialectal correspondences of the reduced labial vowels to encompass also the Ši and Me dialects (see Appendix), then we find that these two dialects regularly show reduced vowels in words for which Aikio has reconstructed PMari reduced vowels on the basis of the other Mari dialects documented in TschWb. In the

---

2.  Curiously, however, in his textbook of Mari historical phonology published over four decades later, Isanbaev (2008: 54–55) reconstructs *ŭ and *ǚ for Proto-Mari and mentions their survival in, besides Northwestern Mari, the Joškar-Ola and (partially) the Volga dialects of Meadow Mari, but he makes no mention of the Menzelinsk dialect.

Me dialect, PMari *ŭ and *ǚ are broadly preserved as such, for example, *kŭm* '3' < PMari *kŭm, *mǚškər* 'belly' < PMari *mǚškər. The Ši dialect, on the other hand, has preserved the reduced quality of these vowels but delabialized them, resulting into *ə̂* and *ə*, respectively, cf. *kə̂m* and *məškər*. At the same time, it should be noted that the Ši dialect preserves PMari *ü according to Aikio's reconstruction as a full vowel *ü* (as did the Me dialect previously, see below), for example, Ši *šüδəməšö* '100th' < PMari *šüδə < PU *śi̯ta.

One attempting to uphold the Bereczki–Agyagási reconstruction, or at the very least its view that reduced labial vowels are a feature unique to the Western Complex, might still argue that the Me and Ši dialects originated in migrants from the Western Complex. After all, while the Eastern Mari diaspora was of basically Meadow Mari origin (Lallukka 2003: 100ff.), it cannot be excluded that some of the migrants coming down from the Middle Vyatka into the present Eastern Mari regions spoke a variety with Western Complex features.

However, from the Ši dialect we find evidence that this dialect should in fact be categorized not among the Western Complex but among the remaining Meadow and Eastern Mari dialects, and therefore the Proto-Mari reduced vowels persisted for a time in Meadow and Eastern Mari, and not simply in the Western Complex. This evidence consists firstly of the reflexes of PMari *pŭśkəla- 'sting' across the dialects. In the dialects attested in TschWb, we find the following outcomes for the first-syllable vocalism of *pŭśkəla-:

| B | Kr | Ka | Ki | S | M | MU | U | V | Nw | W |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| ü | ü | ü | ü | ü | u, ü | u | ŭ | ŭ | ŏ | ə̂ |

(Abbreviations for the Mari dialects employed by TschWb: B = Birsk, Kr = Krasnoufimsk, Ka = Kaltasy, Ki = Bol'šoj Kil'mez, S = Sernur, M = Morki, MU =Mari-Ušem, U = Upša, V = Volga)

In most Meadow and Eastern Mari varieties, the outcome of PMari *ŭ in this word is front *ü*, a reflex which Aikio judges to be irregular but which can easily be explained by the fronting effect of the following palatal *ś.

Turning now to the Eastern Mari data provided by Isanbaev and Veršinin, we find no descendant of PMari *pŭśkəla- 'sting' attested from the Me dialect, but the form in the Ši dialect is *paškəlä-*. Since *ə* in the Ši dialect is the regular outcome of PMari *ǚ, the Ši dialect must have shared

in the fronting of PMari *ŭ found in the other Meadow and Eastern Mari dialects. Otherwise the changes PMari *ŭ > pre-Ši *ŭ > Ši *ə̂ would have occurred and the attested form would be **pə̂škə̂la instead. This isogloss leads us to assume that the merger of the reduced and non-reduced front labial vowels is subsequent to the common ancestor of the Birsk, Krasno-ufimsk, Kaltasy, Bol'šoj Kil'mez, Sernur, Morki and Bol'šaja Šija varieties of Meadow and Eastern Mari. Thus, not only are reduced labial vowels not a post-Proto-Mari development, but *pace* Agyagási, even the retention of reduced labial vowels after the end of Mari unity was not limited to the Western Complex but must have encompassed, for a time, most Meadow Mari dialects.

With regard to full *ü in the Ši dialect, here, too, it is interesting to note that this dialect reflects a sound change shared with most other Meadow Mari and Eastern Mari dialects, and not found in the Western Complex. Ši *küzem* 'climb' shows the same fronting of PMari *u before palatal *ź as in all MariE dialects except the Volga dialect. The Western Complex, on the other hand, shows an unfronted vowel in MariNW W Upša *kuzem*.

In the Menzelinsk dialect, there are some instances of the reduced front rounded vowel *ŭ* against a full rounded vowel in the Western Complex and in the Aikio reconstruction of Proto-Mari vocalism. These in-stances include Menzelinsk *ŭp* 'hair' versus MariE NW W *üp* < PMari *üp, Menzelinsk *mŭkš* 'bee' versus MariE NW W *mükš* < PMari *mükš. Especially striking is Menzelinsk *tŭz* 'pregnant [of animals]', where this dialect shows a reduced vowel even though all other Mari dialects show a full vowel *ü* and the word in fact goes back to a Proto-Mari form *tüəž with a vowel sequence that was later contracted (see Aikio 2014b: 190–191 for this etymology). The presence of a reduced vowel can be noted also in Isanbaev's Menzelsink form *sŭn* 'жила', where all other Mari dialects (with the exception of a single Morki attestation in TschWb) show a full vowel, the Western Complex included. In this case, however, the irregular vocalic correspondences *i ~ ö ~ ü* among the dialects complicate the reconstruc-tion of the Proto-Mari form, in spite of the longstanding Uralic etymology for the word (UEW 441). Nor is this reduction limited to inherited vocab-ulary, as it affected material borrowed from Chuvash, too, cf. *šŭlö* 'дыши' cited by Isanbaev versus MariE W NW *šülem* 'atmen' < Cv. *sïvla-* id.

Such cases of reduction specific to the Menzelinsk dialect must be re-garded as a fairly recent sound shift. Isanbaev (1964: 97) noted the absence of full *ü* in absolute initial position in the Menzelinsk dialect, along with

the rarity of initial-syllable post-consonantal *ü*, and the frequent substitution of this full front rounded vowel by either reduced *ŭ* or a centralized vowel *u̇*. Isanbaev claimed that this tendency was stronger in the speech of younger generations, while older generations sometimes preserved full *ü*. This feature is yet another factor which speaks against any close identification of these Eastern Mari dialects with Northwestern Mari, Hill Mari or the Upša dialect with regard to the full and reduced labial vowels.

However, in Me *ŭŋšö* 'tame', the reduced front labial vowel may be original. This is because a reduced vowel is found also in Ši *əŋəšö* id., but the dialect of Bol'šaja Šija permits initial *ü* and continues to show such a full front rounded vowel in, for example, *ülän* 'внизу'. If this in fact points to PMari *ŭŋəšə with first-syllable reduced vowel, this challenges the etymology recently proposed by Metsäranta (2020: 120–121) that this word is descended from PU *wajŋə- 'henki; hengittää'. On the basis of the Northwestern Mari form *üŋᵘšö* Metsäranta had assumed a PMari full vowel *ü- which would be compatible with PU *waj. Instead, it may be the case that MariNW *ü* here represents an irregular development of PMari *ŭ (compensatory lengthening after syncope of medial *ə*, followed by later insertion of an epenthetic vowel in the cluster?) and the origins of this word may lie somewhere else entirely.

### 3. Eastern Mari data on lowering of *i before sonorants

There is another detail of Mari historical phonology where the Eastern Mari dialects from Udmurtia and Tatarstan documented in Veršinin's dictionary can shed new light. This concerns, among other things, the reflexes of Proto-Mari *i across the Mari varieties as explored by Aikio (2014a: 138–139).

To briefly review Aikio's findings, in the immediate post-Proto-Mari epoch two lowerings of the vowel *i occurred. The first lowering was PMari *i > e before *r* and this affected all Mari dialects, cf. for example MariE W *ner* 'nose' < PMari *nir < PU *närə. The second lowering, which affected *i before sonorants, occurred in all Meadow and Eastern Mari dialects documented in TschWb with the exception of the Upša dialect, cf. for example MariE *βeŋe* but W *βiŋgə* 'son-in-law', MariE *leβa* 'it becomes warm' but W *liβä*, etc.[3]

---

3. Aikio exempts MariE *ime* from this second lowering before sonorants, on the basis that the word is vowel-initial and perhaps the lowering rule did not apply

A consequence of the first lowering process is that the sequence *-ir- was first lost from all Mari dialects, and then it was restored from loanwords, for example in Chuvash borrowings, cf. MariW *irәk* 'freedom' < Cv. *irĕk* id. The sequence *-ir- in early Chuvash loanwords then underwent the second lowering process in Meadow and Eastern Mari, producing MariE *erȃk* 'freedom'.

Based on this observation, Aikio speculates that the words MariE *šere* NW W Upša *širә* 'unleavened' and MariE *ter* NW W Upša *tir* 'sled', with an unlowered sequence -ir- in the western varieties, "could be loanwords from some as yet unidentified source". However, not only has no candidate for borrowing ever been found among the languages with which Mari has been in contact in the post-Proto-Mari era, but in Chuvash the words *šerĕ*, *širĕ* 'несоленый, без соли (о кушанье)' and *yĕltĕr* 'skis' represent borrowings from Mari. Though Cv. *šerĕ*, *širĕ* represent a somewhat late Mari > Chuvash borrowing because it already reflects the shift of PMari *s > š,[4] Cv. *yĕltĕr* (if from a Mari compound *jol* 'foot' + *ter* 'sled', see Fedotov 1990: 301) must have been borrowed quite early to have participated in the Chuvash reduction of original mid and high vowels. Thus, one is inclined to seek some other explanation for these two Mari words than post-Proto-Mari borrowing from some unknown source.

It is here that Veršinin's data from Mari dialects of Udmurtia and Tatarstan is helpful. Aikio bases his claim of the second lowering process (i.e. before sonorants in Meadow and Eastern Mari) on the following

---

in this case. However, with regard to the other non-lowered vowel-initial word Aikio points to, i.e. Mari *imńe* 'horse', in spite of his remark that the word is "not known to be a recent borrowing", already Wichmann (1953: 51) saw Mari *imńe* as a borrowing of Mongolic *emnig*. The highly irregular first-syllable vowel correspondences among the forms of *imńe* attested in TschWb and Beke (*i ~ a ~ e ~ ȃ*) leave no doubt that this word is a post-Proto-Mari borrowing. I am grateful to Alexander Savelyev for drawing my attention to Wichmann's etymology.

4. For 'unleavened' we must reconstruct PMari initial *s- on the basis of the Malmyž form *śer(ә)* in TschWb. Bereczki (1968: 73) dates the shift *s > š, which occurred in all Mari dialects except certain Eastern varieties, to the 17th century. Note that while Agyagási (2000: 15) has considered Mari *šere* to represent a borrowing into both Chuvash and Mari from an unknown, third language of the region, on the basis of the Mari *s > š shift there is no obstacle here to viewing the word as a straightforward loan from Mari into Chuvash, like many other words on her list of "Late Gorodets" loanwords (Culver 2021).

words from TschWb where Meadow and Eastern Mari show *e* while their Hill Mari, Northwestern Mari and Upša cognates show *i*: *leβa* 'it becomes warm', *pembe* 'finch', *šem* 'black', *šen* 'tinder', *ter* 'sled', *βeleš* 'it falls', *βem* 'marrow' and *βeŋe* 'son-in-law'.

For the most part, all Eastern Mari dialects documented by Veršinin reflect the same vowel *e* as the other eastern varieties which Aikio drew from TschWb, that is, Veršinin gives *leβe*, *pembe*, *šen*, *βeleš*, *βem* and *βeŋe*. However, for the words 'sled' and 'black', only some of the Eastern Mari dialects in Veršinin show the vowel *e* which would be expected if this was a matter of Eastern Mari lowering of \*i; other dialects feature instead a different vowel which Veršinin represents as *uᵊ*: *муᵊр* and *шиᵊме*, respectively. As Veršinin (2012: 7) explains in the introduction to his dictionary, by the use of the symbols *uᵉ* and *eᵘ* he denotes a vowel that is intermediate between *e* and *i* (not a diphthong).

The following is a list of all such words in Veršinin where a different vowel, denoted by *uᵊ*, *uᵉ*, or *eᵘ*, is found in various Eastern Mari dialects alongside *e* in other dialects of the region, together with the traditional etymology if one exists (here I will preserve Veršinin's own Cyrillic orthography for these particular forms while transliterating the more mainstream forms into the standard Latin notation):

- *ješ*, *йиᵉш* 'семья' < Chuvash *yïš* id. (Räsänen 1920: 34; Fedotov 1990: 186)
- *preze*, Kukmor *preźe*, Ме *приᵊже* 'телёнок, лосёнок'
- *ser*, also *суᵊр*, Ме *cᵘер* 'берег' < Cv. *śïr-* id. (Räsänen 1920: 191; Fedotov 1990: 240)
- *serem*, Ši *cuᵊрем*, Ме also *cᵘерем* '(на)писать' < Cv. *śïr-* id. (Räsänen 1920: 191; Fedotov 1990: 239–240)
- Sarap. *šekš*, Jelabuga Kukmor *šeɣə̂š*, Ме *шиᵉкⁱ̈ш* 'желчь' < PU \*säppä + \*ksi (UEW 435–436 cites earlier claims for this etymology, though it dismisses Mari from the cognate set)
- *šem(e)*, Mamad. Ši, Ме *шиᵊме* 'чёрный, тёмный' < PU \*šimɜ 'Rost, rostig werden' (UEW 758–759; Bereczki et al. 2013: 224–225)
- *šere* 'пресный, без соли' but Mamad. *шеᵘрäк-шовак* 'нормальный на вкус в отношении соли или кислости'
- *ter*, *муᵊр* 'сани, санный воз'

Thus, Aikio considered *šere* 'unleavened' and Mari *ter* 'sled' to be post-Proto-Mari borrowings because they reflect the same development of restored *ir as in Chuvash loanwords. However, the vowel $u^ə/e^u$ that appears in those two words' Eastern Mari forms is not the typical reflection of *i lowered before sonorants. Moreover, Veršinin's unusual $u^ə/e^u$ vowel is also found in words which we have no reason to consider late borrowings, i.e. Mari *šem(e)* 'black' and *šekš* 'gall', which have always been assumed to represent Uralic inheritance in Mari, or at least to date from a time before Proto-Mari broke up and Mari entered into contact with Turkic and Russian. Furthermore, in the 'gall' word the vowel appears outside of any conditioning environment involving a sonorant, as it does also in 'family' < Chuvash.

Based on this, we might consider certain revisions to our understanding of Mari historical phonology. Firstly, it is possible that Mari *šere* and *ter* are inherited vocabulary, but they simply must be reconstructed for the Proto-Mari stage with a different sequence than *-ir-, where the *i would have undergone lowering. I suggest that we view Veršinin's unusual vowel $u^ə$ in these words as the result of contraction of an original disyllabic sequence (such as *-iə-) at the post-Proto-Mari stage, after the initial lowering of PMari *-ir- to MariE NW W -er-. After all, we know from the etymology of MariE standard *tüz* < PMari *tüəž* 'pregnant (of animals)' < PU *tejniš (Aikio 2014b: 90–91) that Proto-Mari possessed sequences of a full vowel followed immediately by a reduced vowel that underwent contraction in most (but not all) dialects. As another example, compare Mari *juž* 'Luft' with the dialectal data in Beke and TschWb: Eastern Mari (Birsk) *juŭž* preserves the original disyllabic state, while the Hill Mari cognate *jož* assumes an earlier vowel sequence because the correspondence MariE *u* ~ W *o* is regular before a hiatus.

Evidence that Veršinin's vowel is the outcome of contraction comes from the Uralic etymology sometimes proposed for Mari *šekš* 'gall' where the original intervocalic labial stops in PU *säppä would have been lost at some stage. It is known that the PU geminate sequence *pp sometimes gave PMari *w, cf. PU *appa- 'syödä ahnaasti' > PMari *uwe- 'ahmia' (for this etymology, see Metsäranta 2020: 119). However, there is a dearth of examples of words of the shape Cewə̂CC/Cewə̂CV in Mari, suggesting a phonotactic constraint in the prehistory of the language and allowing us to posit loss of intervocalic *w* in this environment; the sole exception *lewə̂še*

'warm' is the present participle of *lewem* 'be warm' and the *w* could have been restored on the basis of that verb.[5]

Therefore, for 'gall' we might reckon with the sequence of changes PU *säppäksi > *sewəks > *seəks > MariE NW *šekš* W *šäkš*. Ultimately only certain Eastern Mari varieties attested in Veršinin preserved a trace of the original disyllabic sequence as the $u^3$ vowel, while in all other dialects the sequence underwent contraction and the result merged with PMari *e and then underwent the divergent developments of Proto-Mari *e (namely preservation in Northwestern Mari and Meadow and Eastern Mari, lowering to *ä* before a velar in Hill Mari, see Aikio 2014a: 135ff).

If contraction is the source of Veršinin's vowel in inherited vocabulary, then we may provisionally reconstruct PMari forms along the lines of *siərə 'unleavened' and *tiər 'sled', though the ultimate etymology of these words requires further investigation.

Also, we must reckon with PMari *siəmə 'black' and in fact reconstructing a trisyllabic form helps to explain those Eastern Mari dialectal forms documented in TschWb that unexpectedly show *i* while other Meadow and Eastern varieties show *e*: in the Ob₂ and Oka (*šim*), Okr (*šime*), and Ok (*śim*) dialects the lowering of PMari *i before the sonorant *m* must have run its course prior to the contraction of an original sequence, *-iə- or the like.

This new Proto-Mari reconstruction in fact fits well with the traditional etymology (UEW 758–759; Bereczki et al. 2013: 224–225) of Mari *šeme* 'black' that compares it to Udmurt *si̯nomi̯-*, *si̯nem* 'rosten, rostig werden'. As *-n- is lost in Mari after front vowels in *i-stems, a Pre-Proto-Mari form *sinəm-, cognate with the Udmurt forms, would have lost the first nasal consonant and been left as *siəm. On the other hand, as a peer reviewer notes, the new Proto-Mari reconstruction *siəm bears "(even more) of a

---

5. The same holds also for words of such shape with initial-syllable *u*, that is, we find a dearth of examples in Mari of CuwâCC/CuwâCV. Bereczki et al. (2013: 220–221) reconstruct a trisyllabic proto-form for Mari *suzo* 'Auerhahn', of Uralic origin according to the UEW (780). Here contraction of an original *šuβəćə would explain those dialectal forms such as UP (Beke's abbreviation for the village of Petrušin/Pečan-Počiŋga) *šuźźô* and Eastern Mari *šujźo* that would be irregular if the proto-form had been disyllabic instead. (The specific proto-form which Bereczki et al. propose is *ćuwićɜ and they argue that the correspondence *s ~ ś* across dialects requires reconstructing initial *ć-. However, considering the palatal nature of the medial *-ć-, it is far more parsimonious to assume original *š-, which in some dialects assimilated to the medial consonant, producing *ś- which then gave modern *s-.)

resemblance" to Iranian *syāma- 'black' (see Mayhofer 1992–2001: II 661 for the reflexes of this (Indo-)Iranian root). However, evidence is lacking for the existence of a descendant of Iranian *syāma- in steppe Iranian; Ossetic – as the descendant of the Alanic spoken in the south Russian steppes – preserves only a root of a different shape, *saw* 'black' < *syāwa- (Cheung 2002: 222–223).

Above it was stated that Veršinin's dialectal data supports Aikio's assumption of a second lowering of *i > *e* before sonorants in Meadow and Eastern Mari, as this is found in *leβe*, *pembe*, *šen*, *βeleš*, *βem*, and *βeŋe*. In all of Veršinin's dialects, this second lowering appears to have affected also borrowings from Chuvash, cf. Veršinin's *em* 'medicine' < Cv. *im* versus *im* in MariW, Veršinin's *er* 'morning' vs. MariW *ir*, and Veršinin's *terke* 'plate' < Cv. *tirkĕ*.

Yet while most Meadow Mari dialects reflect both Chuvash *i* and *ï* as *e*, certain of Veršinin's Eastern Mari dialects reflect Cv. *i* as *e* but Cv. *ï* as the *uᵊ* vowel. Since it was suggested above that the *uᵊ* vowel is the result of contraction of a Proto-Mari sequence *-iə-, this points to Cv. *ï* having been in fact borrowed into Mari as the sequence *iə, preserved as such in certain of Veršinin's Eastern Mari dialects, and only later merging with *e* in other dialects. After all, the Chuvash high back unrounded vowel *ï* has no counterpart in the Mari vowel system and would have posed a challenge of assimilation to Mari speakers.

If Chuvash *ï* were borrowed into Mari as a sequence that would be reflected among Veršinin's dialects as the *uᵊ* vowel, then this could have ramifications for the etymology of Mari *βer* 'place'. Fedotov (1990: 179) suggests that the Mari word represents a borrowing of Cv. *vïrăn* id. Veršinin's data on Mari *βer* shows a uniform *e* vocalism and not the *uᵊ* vowel. If these Eastern Mari varieties show only the form *βer*, then along with MariE *βer* W *βär* documented from other dictionaries, perhaps the word is to be reconstructed as PMari *βer and represents inherited material instead of being a loan from Chuvash.

Unfortunately however Veršinin does not clearly state which of his Eastern Mari dialects have the *uᵊ* vowel, which would allow the reader to determine if *e* is given as the sole vocalism simply because no form whatsoever was elicited from one of the dialects which possess *uᵊ*. A similar conundrum exists in the case of Mari *serlayem* 'уберечь от беды' < Cv. *śïrlăx* (on the etymology see Fedotov 1990: 240), where absence of evidence for the *uᵊ* vowel in Veršinin does not necessarily mean evidence of absence.

## 4. Palatalized *ŕ* in the Krasnoufimsk dialect

A palatalized *ŕ* exists in certain Mari dialects alongside unpalatalized *r*. These have been briefly touched on by Gruzov (1969: 177–178) and Bereczki (1994: 64), who mention the phenomenon's existence in the Volga dialect, the Kilʹmez dialect and in islands of Tatarstan and Bashkiria. Gruzov dates the rise of this phenomenon to the 17th and 18th centuries and notes its presence in early written sources for the Mari language.

*Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch* contains data on the Krasnoufimsk dialect in phonetic transcription, as gathered by Arvid Genetz in the village of Nižnij Potam. The Krasnoufimsk data stands somewhat at odds with the picture given by Gruzov and Bereczki. Firstly, Gruzov emphasizes that the palatalized *ŕ* in the Russian source words was replaced by a hard *r* in these dialects, and he cites the following examples: *радам*, *рат* 'ряд', *лар* 'ларь', *лодыр* 'лодырь', *понар* 'фонарь', *кир*, *кира* 'гиря', and *косор* 'косарь'. This lack of palatalization is found in Krasnoufimsk *rat* and *ponar* (Mari *lar*, *loδǝr*, and *kosor* are not attested from the Krasnoufimsk dialect in Genetz's material). However, in its borrowing of Russian *гиря*, Krasnoufimsk does indeed show a palatalized *ŕ*: *kiŕ*.

Secondly, Bereczki speaks of Mari *r* undergoing palatalization in these dialects mainly under the influence of the vowel *i*. In the Krasnoufimsk dialect, however, the data actually shows that palatalization occurred mainly in the environment of the vowel *e*.

The examples of Krasnoufimsk palatalized *ŕ* in TschWb are few enough that they can be cited here in full. Note that in some cases the editors of TschWb did not write *ŕ* for the Krasnoufimsk form in the headword, but further down in the entry the Krasnoufimsk resonant is indeed marked as palatalized. For example, TschWb gives "*meraŋ* Ob₁ Oka Okr Mm₂", where the abbreviation Okr represents the Krasnoufimsk dialect, but a few lines later "*meŕaŋ-gaška* Okr Falle".

Thus the examples of Krasnoufimsk palatalized *ŕ* along with the Proto-Mari form and/or, in case of loanwords,[6] the source form, are the following:

- *βeŕ* 'place' < PMari *βer or Cv. *vĭrǎn*
- *βeŕa* 'religion' < Ru. *вера*
- *βüŕaŋ* 'Tüderstrick' < *βŭräŋ < Cv., also palatalized in Birsk

---

6. For the Tatar loanwords, see Räsänen (1923) and Isanbaev (1994).

- *čeŕan* 'Krankhaft' < Tat. *çer*
- *čuŕi* '(Gesichts)farbe' < Tat. *çïray*, but also unpalatalized *čuri* is attested from the same dialect
- *čălβâŕ* 'Kette' < Tat. *çïlbïr*
- *eŕ* 'morning' < *ir < Cv. *ir*
- *iśeŕ* 'gelt, unfruchtbar' < Cv. *xěsěr*
- *iŕ* 'wild' < Cv. *xir*
- *jeŕ* 'lake' < PMari *jer
- *juŕan* 'regnerisch' < *jur
- *keŕam* 'hineinstechen' < PMari *kiräm
- *kiŕ* 'Gewicht' < Ru. *гиря*
- *küŕam* 'reißen, zerren' < PMari *kŭräm
- *küŕän* 'Schlitten (mit Seiten aus Lindenrinde)' < PMari *kŭrän, but *kür* 'Bast'
- *meŕaŋ* 'hare' (origin unknown, a notorious etymological crux – see Culver 2021)
- *neŕ* 'nose' in *čâra neŕ* 'Kienspan' < PMari *nir, genitive singular *neŕân*
- *śeŕ* 'riverbank' < Cv. *śir*
- *śeŕem* 'write' < Cv. *śir-*
- *šeŕγe* 'comb' < PMari *širγe
- *šeŕγe* 'expensive' < PMari *širγe
- *töŕ* 'aufrichtig, rechtschaffen', *[ik] töŕaš* 'Altersgenosse' < Cv. *türě*
- *töŕa/töŕä* 'Herr (des Hauses)' < Tat. *türä*
- *tüŕâs* 'ganz' < Tat. *döres* 'true'

Thus the most common environment for palatalized *ŕ* in this dialect is in the position after *e*, and also before *a* (< *ä), with fewer examples of *i* in spite of Bereczki's claim that this was the triggering vowel. That palatalization of *r* was triggered by specifically *e*, and not the vowel *i which was later lowered to *e* in Eastern Mari before sonorants, is suggested by *jer* 'lake'. This would mean also that in the word *šeŕγe* 'comb' < PMari *širγe, the palatalization must date well after the early lowering of PMari *i > *e* before *r*. Similarly, if 'sled' is to be reconstructed as disyllabic *tiǝr or the like, then palatalization was presumably subsequent to contraction: *tiǝr > *ter > *teŕ.

   Besides the general tendencies of palatalization due to the vocalic environment that are clear from Genetz' data, Krasnoufimsk *čălβâŕ* 'Kette' < Tat. *çïlbïr* suggests that an initial palatal consonant could palatalize a following *r*, as both the Tatar source form and the Krasnoufimsk word are

back-vocalic. The same is probably true of *čuŕi* '(Gesichts)farbe' < Tat. *çiray* and *juŕan* 'regnerisch' < *jur.

In spite of the above-cited data where palatalized *ŕ* is clearly document- ed in Genetz' data as represented in TschWb, there are a number of exam- ples of comparable phonetic environments with *e* or other front vowels where no palatalization is attested:

- *βińer* 'Leinen, Leinwand' < PMari *βəńer
- *βüräŋeš* 'mit Blut beschmutz werden' < PMari *βŭräŋeš
- *eŋer* 'river' < PMari *eŋer
- *ere* 'sauber' < *ire < ? Cv. *ïră*
- *jə̂raŋ* 'Beet' < *jəräŋ < Cv. *yăran*
- *kerγe* 'Schwartzpecht' < PMari *kirγə
- *śerlaγem*, *śə̂rlaγem* 'erlösen, begnadigen, erbarmen' < Cv. *śïrlăx*
- *šer* 'Ader' < PMari *ser
- *tör* 'hinterer Teil des Raums' < Tat. *tür*

The reason for the lack of palatalization in these cases is unclear. It is pos- sible that Genetz did not note down every instance of palatalization when collecting his data, or that the editors of TschWb obscured the presence of Krasnoufimsk palatalization when they combined his data from this dialect with that from other dialects. Nevertheless, those cases of clear palatalization cited above suffice to provide a more accurate view of this phenomenon than the traditional picture in Gruzov and Bereczki.

## 5. The Proto-Mari consonant clusters *-zγ-, *-žγ- and *-źγ-

Proto-Uralic did not permit voiced clusters consisting of a sibilant followed by a velar, while those unvoiced sibilant + velar clusters which did exist in PU are preserved as unvoiced in Mari, cf. for example Mari *šüškam* 'cram, pack' < PU *süskä, Mari *kəškem* 'throw' < PU *kiśkɜ- (UEW 667, 768). Consequently, any voiced sibilant + velar cluster in Mari must have arisen through either loss of an intervening vowel or borrowing.

In his survey of Mari consonantism, Bereczki (1994: 30–64) traced the evolution of Mari consonants and consonant clusters out of those which existed in Proto-Uralic. Consequently, his survey did not cover voiced clusters. Here I wish to fill in this gap by examining certain voiced clusters consisting of a sibilant followed by the velar fricative.

Firstly, MariE *küžγö* NW *kŭžγŭ* W *kəžγə* 'thick' but Malmyž *küźγö* (in Beke), *küzγö* (in Isanbaev 1964: 97) allow reconstructing PMari *küzγə, as the Malmyž dialect preserves a distinct reflex of the Proto-Mari sibilants *s, *z in a front-vocalic environment when all other dialects shifted them to *š, *ž.[7] (UEW 161 also connects this word to Permian and Khanty material suggesting PU *s, which would give PMari *z.). Consequently, *-zγ- clusters can be assumed to have existed by the Proto-Mari era.

Similarly, we can reconstruct the presence of *-žγ- clusters for Proto-Mari on the basis of, for example, Mari *šüžγe* 'colic pains, sharp sticking pain'.[8] The existence of Malmyž *šüžγe* (as attested in Beke) against *šüžγe* elsewhere in Meadow, Eastern, and Northwestern Mari (the word is not attested from Hill Mari) demands this reconstruction, as if the Proto-Mari cluster were *-zγ- instead, the Malmyž dialect would show instead **\*šüźγe*.

However, in the case of Mari *üzγar* 'tool, utensil, equipment; object, thing, item', we find that some dialects show the medial cluster -*žγ*- while others show -*zγ*-, and this opposition is not limited to the Malmyž dialect versus all others. Such a correspondence cannot regularly go back to either *-zγ- or *-žγ-, and this fact suggests that we are dealing with a different cluster at the Proto-Mari stage. The medial clusters attested in this word across the Mari dialects (as documented in TschWb, Beke, and Veršinin) are as follows:

-*žγ*-:  Hill Mari, Northwestern Mari, Birsk, Krasnoufimsk, Sernur, Mari Ušem, Volga, Upša, some Morki varieties

-*zγ*-:  Kugu Molamas, other Morki varieties, Menzelinsk, Bol'šaja Šija

Beke's form *ŭźγar* from the Kugu Molamas dialect, as well as the form (dialect unspecified) ‹ÿзьгäр› in the dictionary of Troitskij (1895) show a clearly palatal *ź*. This allows us to conclude that in the cases where *z* is found in the cluster, this is the result of the depalatalization of PMari *ź

---

7.  PMari *z can often be reconstructed on the basis of the reflex *ź* in a front-vowel environment in the Malmyž dialect versus *ž* elsewhere in Mari: MariE *mâžer* 'caftan' but Malmyž *miźer*, MariE *keŋež* 'summer' but Malmyž *keŋeź*; for the latter word, see Bereczki et al. (2013: 50).

8.  Important to note for the present discussion is that the headword **šüžγe** in Beke's dictionary must be viewed as a misprint for **šüžγe**. In all of Beke's example sentences under the entry with that headword, we find instead forms with *ž*, and this is reflected also by all other sources on the Mari lexicon.

in most Mari dialects,[9] and not an instance of the later *z* found in Tatar borrowings where no Mari dialect shows a palatalized sibilant (e.g. Mari *teŋôz* 'sea'< Tatar *deŋiz*).

Thus we are confronted here with a vacillation between *z* (or a still palatal *ź*) and *ž* on the one hand, and between front and back labial vowels on the other. While Aikio (2014a) reconstructed the word as *ŭžγar* with front vocalism and original *ž, I believe that the diverging dialectal outcomes are better explained by a proto-form *ŭźγar with back vocalism and a different PMari cluster. The reflexes with front vocalism would then be due to the fronting effect of the following palatal *ź (as in the case of PMari *pŭśkəla 'sting' and *kuźem 'climb' discussed above), and the seemingly irregular correspondence *z* ~ *ž* has resulted from different dialectal treatments of the *-źγ- cluster.

No solid etymology for Mari *üzγar* 'tool' has been proposed; the attempt of Veršinin (2017–2018: 581) to connect the word to Mari *ôštem* 'do' or Finnish *askar* 'work' can be dismissed due to the completely irregular sound correspondences. However, we find a strikingly similar counterpart to Mari *üzγar* in Ossetic, the descendant of the Alanic language once spoken in the South Russian steppes and the source of a number of Mari words. In Ossetic, the word *zγär* originally denoted 'armor' and has cognates in Khwarezmian and Pashto, all derived from Proto-Iranian *uz-gar (Abaev IV 308–309; Lurje 2019: 512). However, as Abaev notes, the Ossetic word has come to mean also simply 'metal' (and the derived adjective *zγällag* – attested in *zγällagkom* 'удила' assumes solely a meaning 'metal'). As further examples beyond Abaev's one can cite the compounds in the modern Digor dialect *zγärävdozän* 'болт' and *zγärbenden* 'трос', where all reference to 'armor' is lost. The borrowing of a word 'metal item, metal tool' from Alanic into Mari would be completely in harmony with the fact that other Mari words for metal-working were ultimately borrowed from Iranian, cf. Mari *kürtńö* 'iron' (UEW 653; see Holopainen 2019: 121–125 for a more exhaustive treatment).[10] Within Mari the meaning of the word then underwent semantic bleaching from 'tool' to 'object' in general.

---

9. For a clear explanation of the reconstruction of the value *ź (< *ć) for this consonant and its reflexes, see Aikio (2014b: 86–87).
10. Furthermore, Iranian *zγar was borrowed also into Khanty (Joki 1973: 323), though there solely in the original meaning 'armor'.

The Alanic initial cluster would have required adaptation to Mari phonotaxis, and the back reduced labial vowel *ŭ has been a favored means of adapting phonologically impermissible initials, cf. for example MariE *užaβa* W *ɔ̂žaβa* 'frog' < Ru. *жаба* id. (see Savatkova 1969).

To the best of my knowledge, this is the only instance where the cluster *-źγ- can be reconstructed in ordinary vocabulary; in the phonological history of Mari, this cluster clearly played a marginal role. In fact, it is doubtful whether such a voiced cluster would have even been possible in the inherited Uralic material: unlike the sibilants *z and *ž which could be voiced word-finally, the affricate *ć was voiced only medially while remaining unvoiced word-finally (an alternation which remains operative in Mari today, cf. *kambozam* 'fall' with the imperative *kamboč* 'fall!'). Consequently, addition of a velar-initial suffix could have produced only an unvoiced cluster instead.

Nevertheless, I argue that *-źγ- was eventually viewed as a permitted cluster, for it had already arisen in onomatopoeic or sound-symbolism roots, a highly productive class of words in Mari. For example, the notion 'thick (of hair), shaggy' is expressed by such forms as MariE Kukmor *lözγa*, Birsk *lüžγä*, Upša *lŭžγa*, MariW *lɔ̂zγitä*, etc. (cf. also *lözmön* id.), where we can suppose earlier *-źγ-.

One might wonder, however, why the Alanic *-z- would be reflected by an affricate *ź in Mari. It may be simply that phonetically, Alanic *z was simply closer to PMari *ź to Mari ears than to *z; in the dialects of modern Ossetic, /z/ is realized as [z] or [ʒ] (Abaev 1964: 7). Yet, this is not a phenomenon limited to Mari. As Sampsa Holopainen has recently emphasized in an unpublished conference presentation, Permian shows an affricate for Iranian *z in certain loanwords listed by Rédei (1986): Proto-Permian *erʒí 'eagle' borrowed from Iranian *r̥zi- < *r̥dzi-, cf. Av *ərəzi-fiia-* 'Adler', and Proto-Permian *bäriʒ 'linden' borrowed from Iranian *barza- (< Proto-Indo-Iranian *bhr̥Hźa-) > Oss *bœrzœ*.

If we accept this etymology, then it entails some matters of relative chronology. Firstly, the Alanic word must have been borrowed into pre-Proto-Mari subsequent to the pre-Proto-Mari development of voiced sibilant+velar clusters through syncope, because if the Proto-Uralic phonotactic constraint of only unvoiced clusters still existed, one would have expected the source voiced cluster to be reflected by an unvoiced cluster in Mari. Secondly, turning once more to the dialectal reflexes of PMari *ŭźγar, from those forms with both *ü* and *ž*, we can conclude that the shift

of the PMari cluster *-źγ- to -žγ- in those dialects was subsequent to fronting of the first-syllable vowel, as the new non-palatal *ž* would have bled any environment for vowel fronting.

Finally, as an example of the light that the prehistory of Mari might shed on other languages of the region, the ancestor of Ossetic *zyär* must have gained the meaning 'metal' in addition to 'armor' already while its Alanic ancestor was still spoken in the South Russian steppes in proximity to Mari, and not later when the language became restricted to the North Caucasus. This may already be implied by the derived adjective *zyällag* 'metal' < *zɣär+i̯ag, as the Pre-Ossetic shift of *ri̯ > *ll was complete already by the early first millennium AD on the basis of onomastic evidence (Palunčić 2019: 313).[11]

## Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| Cv. | Chuvash |
| Mari E | Meadow and Eastern Mari |
| NW | Northwestern Mari |
| W | Hill Mari |
| Me | Menzelinsk dialect of Eastern Mari |
| Ši | Bolʹšaja Šija dialect of Eastern Mari |
| Mamad. | Mamadyš dialect of Eastern Mari |
| PMari | Proto-Mari |
| PU | Proto-Uralic |
| Ru. | Russian |
| Tat. | Tatar |

---

11. A peer reviewer suggests that *zyällag* 'metal (adj.)' could have been formed later on the basis of analogy with other examples of nouns in *-r* versus derived adjectives in *-llag*, as "the suffix *-i̯āg was quite productive in Ossetic". However, Cheung (2002: 115) presents examples of coinages subsequent to the sound change *ri̯ > *ll where the consonant *r* is preserved in the derivation, and furthermore the derivation features what Cheung calls Late *i*-Epenthesis: *bajrag* 'foal' < *bar 'horse'; *bazajrag* 'pertaining to the bazar' < *bazar* (< Persian); and *caɣajrag* 'slave (adj.)' < *caɣar* 'slave'. Consequently, the expected late formation from *zyär* + *-i̯āg would be **zyäjrag*. Moreover, if Komi *körtvom* 'horse bit (lit. metal mouth)' is indeed a calque of *zyällagkom* id. as Abaev (IV 308) suggests, then this is additional evidence that *zyar* came to mean generic 'metal' – and the corresponding adjective *zyällag* was coined – when Alanic was still spoken in the steppes, not later.

# References

Abaev 1958–1989 = Абаев, В. И. 1958–1989. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка.* Москва–Ленинград: Наука.

Abaev, V. I. 1964. *A grammatical sketch of Ossetic.* Bloomington: Indiana University & The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Agyagási, Klára. 2000. Der sprachliche Nachlaß der Spät-Gorodec Bevölkerung in den tschuwaschischen und mariischen Mundarten. *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 7. 3–26.

Agyagási, Klára. 2019. *Chuvash historical phonetics* (Turcologica 117). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Aikio, Ante. 2014a. On the reconstruction of Proto-Mari vocalism. *Journal of Language Relationship* 11. 125–158.

Aikio, Ante. 2014b. Studies in Uralic etymology III: Mari etymologies. *Linguistica Uralica* 50 (2). 81–93. https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2014.2.01.

Beke, Ödön. 1997. *Mari nyelvjárási szótár (Tscheremissisches Dialektwörterbuch).* Edited by Bereczki, Gábor & Kuznecova, Margarita. Szombathely.

Bereczki, G. 1968. Wichtigere lautgeschichtliche Lehren der russischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen. In *Congressus Secundus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Helsingiae habitus 23.–28. VIII. 1965. Pars I. Acta Linguistica*, 70–76. Helsinki: Societas Fenno-Ugrica.

Bereczki, Gábor. 1977. Permi-cseremisz lexikális kölcsönzések. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 79. 57–77.

Bereczki, Gábor. 1992. *Grundzüge der tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte II* (Studia Uralo-Altaica 34). Szeged.

Bereczki, Gábor. 1994. *Grundzüge der tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte I* (Studia Uralo-Altaica 35). Szeged.

Bereczki, Gábor & Agyagási, Klára & Winkler, Eberhard. 2013. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Tscheremissischen (Mari): Der einheimische Wortschatz* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 86). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Cheung, Johnny. 2002. *Studies in the historical development of the Ossetic vocalism* (Beiträge zur Iranistik 21). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Culver, Christopher. 2021. On Some Chuvash–Mari shared lexemes and Agyagási's 'Late Gorodets' hypothesis. In Szeverényi, Sándor (ed.), *Proceedings of the 5th Mikola Conference*, 185–200. Szeged.

Fedotov = Федотов, М. Р. 1990. *Чувашскомарийские языковые взаимосвязи.* Саранск: Издательство Саратовского университета, Саранский филиал.

Gruzov = Грузов, Л. П. 1969. *Историческая грамматика марийского языка: Введение и фонетика.* Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Holopainen, Sampsa 2019. *Indo-Iranian borrowings in Uralic: Critical overview of sound substitutions and distribution criterion.* PhD thesis, University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-5729-4

Isanbaev 1964 = Исанбаев, Н. И. 1964. "Из наблюдений над фонетикой говора мензелинских мари." In *Вопросы марийского языка*, 89–103. Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Isanbaev 1994 = Исанбаев, Н. И. 1994. *Марийско-тюркские языковые кон-
такты. Часть вторая*. Йошкар-Ола: Научный центр Финно-угроведе-
ния, Марийский научно-исследовательский институт языка, литерату-
ры и истории им. В. М. Васильева.

Isanbaev 2008 = Исанбаев, Н. И. 2008. *Марий исторический фонетика*.
Йошкар-Ола: Марий кугыжаныш университет.

Joki, Aulis J. 1973. *Uralier und Indogermanen: Die älteren Berührungen zwischen
den uralischen und indogermanischen Sprachen* (Mémoires de la Société Fin-
no-Ougrienne 151). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Lallukka, Seppo. 2003. *From fugitive peasants to diaspora: The Eastern Mari in
Tsarist and Federal Russia* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia Huma-
niora 328). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Lurje, Pavel. 2019. Etymologies of selected terms for weapons in Chorasmian.
In Badalkhan, Sabir & Basello, Gian Petro & de Chiara, Matteo (eds.), *Iranian
studies in honour of Adriano V. Rossi*, 511–518. Napoli: UniorPress.

Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoari-
schen I–III*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Metsäranta, Niklas. 2020. *Periytyminen ja lainautuminen: Marin ja permi-
läisten kielten sanastontutkimusta*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. (Doctoral
dissertation.)

Palunčić, Filip. 2019. Ossetic historical phonology and North-Eastern Iranian
anthroponomastics from the North Pontic region 1st – 5th c. CE. In Lurje,
Pavel B. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth European Conference of Iranian Stud-
ies*, 311–329. St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Publishers.

Räsänen, Martti. 1920. *Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissi-
schen* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XLVIII). Helsinki: Société
Finno-Ougrienne.

Räsänen, Martti. 1923. *Die tatarischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen* (Mé-
moires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne L). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Rédei, Károly. 1986. *Zu indogermanisch-uralische Sprachkontakten*. Wien: Ver-
lag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Savatkova = Саваткова, А. А. 1969. *Русские заимствования в марийском
языке*. Йошкар-Ола: Марийское книжное издательство.

Troitskij = Троицкий, В. П. 1895. *Черемисско-русский словарь*. Казань.

TschWb = Moisio, Arto & Saarinen, Sirkka (eds.). 2008. *Tscheremissisches Wörter-
buch* (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXXII). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilai-
nen Seura.

UEW = Rédei, Károly (ed.). 1986–1991. *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*.
Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Veršinin 2011 = Вершинин, В. И. 2011. *Словарь марийский говоров Татарста-
на и Удмуртии*. Йошкар-Ола.

Veršinin 2017–2018 = Вершинин, В. И. 2017–2018. *Марий мут-влакын кушеч
лиймышт (этимологий мутер)*. Йошкар-Ола.

Wichmann, Yrjö. 1953. *Tscheremissische Texte mit Wörterverzeichnis und gram-
matikalischem Abriss*, Zweite Auflage (Hilfsmittel für das Studium der fin-
nisch-ugrischen Sprachen V). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

**Appendix:**
**Reflexes of the Proto-Mari reduced labial vowels across the Mari dialects**

The following tables extend those in Aikio (2014a) to encompass also the Menzelinsk (Me) and Bolʹšaja Šija (Ši) dialects of Eastern Mari as documented in the dictionary of Veršinin or, in cases where data is missing in Veršinin, from Isanbaev (1964). Aikio's transcription of Mari, somewhat different than the traditional transcription used in this paper, is preserved, as is the consequent alphabetical order. The question mark (?) denotes cases where Veršinin included the word in his dictionary but did not give a clearly labeled Me or Ši form, while blank entries reflect the total absence of the word from Veršinin's dictionary and from Isanbaev (1964). Reflexes in the Me and Ši dialects which are judged irregular are denoted in bold. Note the following changes from Aikio's table: *kŭsedǝk* 'lapwing' has been removed as this is a Permian loanword (Bereczki 1977: 69–70), the irregular dialectal correspondences of which suggest a post-Proto-Mari borrowing; the proto-forms of Mari *küžÿö* 'thick' and *üzÿar* 'tool; object' have been altered from Aikio's version to reflect the reconstructions argued in the present paper; and instead of Aikio's proto-form *pŭdešta- 'burst', the Kukmor dialect form *puδestaltam* in Veršinin's dictionary and the Malmyž form *puδeśtal-* in Beke's dictionary suggest PMari *pŭdesta- instead.

Proto-Mari *ŭ

|  | Me | Ši |
|---|---|---|
| *čŭme- 'tread' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *jŭgǝńča- 'have hiccups' | ? | ? |
| *jŭle- 'burn' | ? | ? |
| *jŭmə 'god' | ? | ? |
| *jŭt 'night' | ? | ? |
| *kŭ- (interrogative pronoun root) | ? | ? |
| *kŭče- 'hold, grab' | ŭ | |
| *kŭdala- 'run (animal); ride fast' | ? | ? |
| *kŭdakša- 'take off' | ŭ | ? |
| *kŭm 'three' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *kŭmda 'broad' | ŭ | ? |
| *kŭme- 'close the eyes' | ? | ? |
| *kŭmək 'upside down' | ? | ? |

|  | Me | Ši |
|---|---|---|
| *kŭməž 'birch-bark' | ŭ[a], ə̂[b] | ə̂ |
| *kŭpe- 'get mouldy' |  |  |
| *kŭpšəl'ə 'jay' | ? | ? |
| *kŭptərge- 'get wrinkled' | ? | ? |
| *kŭrala- 'plough' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *kŭrək 'mountain' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *kŭrəkš 'bark basket' | ? | ? |
| *kŭrgə 'food, fodder' |  |  |
| *kŭrgəža- 'run' | ? | ə̂ |
| *kŭrməcak 'woodcock' |  |  |
| *kŭškeda- 'tear' | ? | ? |
| *kŭškəža- 'mount (horse)' | ŭ[c] | ? |
| *kŭt 'length' | ŭ | u |
| *kŭtkə 'ant' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *kŭwa 'old woman' | ŭ | ? |
| *kŭwəl 'bubble' | ? | ? |
| *kŭž 'urine' |  |  |
| *lŭda- 'count' | ? | u |
| *lŭdə 'duck' | ? | ? |
| *lŭge- 'mix' | ? | ? |
| *lŭj 'marten' | ? | u |
| *lŭk 'corner, bend' | ? | ? |
| *lŭkta- 'take out' | ŭ | ? |
| *lŭm 'snow' | u | ə̂ |
| *lŭmej 'blackfly' |  |  |
| *lŭpš 'dew' | u | ə̂ |
| *lŭpš 'whip' | ? | ə̂ |
| *lŭške- 'loosen' | ŭ | u |
| *mŭncalte- ~ *pŭncalte- 'slide' | ? | ? |
| *mŭč 'end' | ? | ? |
| *mŭcə 'hazel grouse' | ? | ? |
| *mŭčə-wuj 'tussock' | ŭ | ? |
| *mŭgəl'ə 'gnarl' | ? | ? |
| *mŭgər 'bend' | ? | ? |
| *mŭndəra 'ball (of yarn)' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *mŭnə 'egg' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *mŭńəj 'toad' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *mŭrə 'song' | ŭ | ? |
| *mŭška- 'wash' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *mŭškəndə 'fist' | ŭ | ? |
| *mŭžeda- 'tell the fortune' | ŭ | ə̂ |

---

a. As cited in Isanbaev (1964).

b. As cited in Veršinin's dictionary.

c. On the basis of *kŭškŭžmo* 'вторник' (lit. 'riding day') cited in Isanbaev (1964).

## Some details of Mari historical phonology

|  | Me | Ši |
|---|---|---|
| *mŭžə 'illness; evil spirit' | ? | ? |
| *mŭsge- 'chew something soft' |  |  |
| *nŭcəl- 'scratch' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *nŭgədə 'thick (of fluids)' | ŭ | ? |
| *nŭle- 'lick' | ? | ? |
| *nŭlgə 'silver fir' | ? | ? |
| *nŭnə 'they' | ?? | ?? |
| *nŭr 'field' | ŭ | ? |
| *nŭška-, *nŭškəšta- 'crawl' | ? | ? |
| *pŭč 'stalk, tube' | ? | ? |
| *pŭče- 'fall (of water level)' | ? | ? |
| *pŭčəšte- 'itch' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭdesta- 'burst' | ? | ? |
| *pŭdərge- 'break' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭl-wuj 'knee' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭn 'hair' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭncala- 'wring' | ? | ? |
| *pŭndaš 'bottom' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭne- 'braid' | ? | ə̂ |
| *pŭńəlmə 'bumblebee' | ? | ? |
| *pŭnəške- 'get moldy' | **u** | ? |
| *pŭra- 'bite, chew' | ? | ? |
| *pŭre- 'enter' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭrgeda- 'hoe, dig up, burrow' | ? | ? |
| *pŭrgəšte- 'snow over' | ? | ə̂ |
| *pŭśkəla- 'sting' | ? | ə |
| *pŭš 'boat' | **u** | ? |
| *pŭškeda- 'have diarrhoea' | ŭ | ? |
| *pŭškədə 'soft' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *pŭt, *pŭtərak 'strong' | ŭ | ? |
| *pŭžar 'plane' | ? | ə̂ |
| *rŭde- 'unbind' | ? | ? |
| *rŭmbək 'mud' | ŭ | ? |
| *šŭgəńə 'lever' |  |  |
| *šŭldər 'feather' | ŭ | ? |
| *šŭle- 'melt' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *šŭləkš 'boot leg' | ? | ə̂ |
| *šŭma- 'get tired' | ? | ə̂ |
| *šŭme- 'whet' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *šŭŋgalta- 'fall head-on' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *šŭpša- 'pull, suck' | ŭ | ə̂ |

|  | Me | Ši |
|---|---|---|
| *šŭr 'shit' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *šŭre- 'pound, crush' | ? | ə̂ |
| *sŭwan 'boil, abscess' | ü | ? |
| *šŭwəkš 'leather sack' | ? | ? |
| *tŭdə 'this' | ŭ | **u, ə̂** |
| *tŭgər 'shirt' | ŭ | **u, ə̂** |
| *tŭjə 'sick, lean' | ? | ? |
| *tŭl 'fire' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *tŭnəma- 'learn' | ŭ | ? |
| *tŭŋgər 'thick tree bark' | ? | ə̂ |
| *tŭp 'back' | ŭ | ? |
| *tŭpka 'heckeled flax or hemp' |  |  |
| *tŭrta- 'shrink' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *tŭrəža- 'trample' | ŭ | ? |
| *tŭške- 'glue' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *tŭšte- 'ask a riddle' | ? | **u** |
| *tŭtəš 'often, constantly' |  |  |
| *tŭwəle- 'defend, rescue' |  |  |
| *tŭwərge- 'curdle, turn sour' | ŭ | ? |
| *ŭdəla- 'pray for' |  |  |
| *ŭdəre- 'rake' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *ŭla- 'be' | ŭ |  |
| *ŭlde- 'ask for' | **ə̂** | ə̂ |
| *ŭľmə 'man' | ? | ? |
| *ŭmša 'mouth' | ŭ | ?? |
| *ŭmər 'warm' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *ŭmbal 'distant' | ? | ə̂ |
| *ŭre- 'put in the ground' |  | **u** |
| *ŭrə 'two handfuls' |  | **u** |
| *ŭrge- 'sew' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *ŭškal 'cow' | ŭ | ∅ |
| *ŭžar 'green' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *ŭžga 'fur-coat' |  |  |
| *wŭcək 'much' | **u** | ? |
| *wŭče- 'wait' | **u** | **u** |
| *wŭľe- 'get spoiled' | **u** | ? |
| *wŭlnə 'tin' | ? | ə̂ |
| *wŭrde- 'tend' |  |  |
| *wŭrgem 'clothes' | ŭ | ə̂ |
| *wŭrgəže- 'be restless' | ŭ | **ŭ** |
| *wŭrt 'heddle' | ŭ, ə | ə̂ |
| *wŭž (onomatopoetic root) | ? | ? |
| *wŭžale- 'buy' | **ŭ** | **u** |

Proto-Mari *ŭ̈

|  | Me | Ši |
| --- | --- | --- |
| čŭ̈čə 'maternal uncle' | ? | ü |
| čŭdə 'lack, need' |  |  |
| čŭ̈ŋge- 'peck (of birds)' | ? | ü |
| kŭč 'nail' | ? | ? |
| kŭče- 'beg' | ? | ? |
| kŭcə 'knife' | ? | ? |
| kŭdər 'black grouse' | ŭ | ə |
| kŭdərte- 'thunder' | ? | ə |
| kŭnčä- 'dig' | **ü** | ? |
| kŭpš 'shag' |  |  |
| kŭr 'bast' | ? | ə |
| kŭra- 'tear, rip' | ŭ̈ | ə |
| kŭrtńə 'iron' | ŭ̈ | ə |
| kŭzgə 'thick' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| lŭgəšte- 'itch' | ? | ? |
| lŭkə 'boggy area' | ? | ? |
| lŭm 'name' | ŭ̈ | **ü**, ə |
| lŭmə 'scab' | ? | ? |
| lŭŋge- 'rock' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| lŭškalta- 'shake, swing' | ? | ? |
| lŭšte- 'milk' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| mŭndər 'far' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| mŭškər 'belly' | ŭ̈ | ə |
| nŭštala- 'blow one's nose' | ? | ? |
| nŭškə 'blunt' | ? | **ü** |
| nŭža- 'scrape' | ? | ? |
| pŭčka- 'cut off' | **ü** | ə |
| pŭnčə 'pine' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| pŭrde- 'cover with a cloth' | ? | ? |
| rŭce- 'shake' | **ü** | **ü** |
| rŭdaŋa- 'rust' | **ü** | ? |
| rŭde- 'pick, pluck' | ? | **ü** |
| rŭdə 'core' | ? | ? |
| rŭm(b)alge- 'get dark' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| rŭpśe- 'rock' | ŭ̈ | ? |
| rŭškalta- 'quake, rumble' | ? | ? |
| rŭškə 'gnarl' |  |  |
| sŭdər(n)e- 'drag' |  |  |

| | Me | Ši |
|---|---|---|
| sŭke- 'shove' | ʔ | ə |
| sŭlə 'fathom' | ŭ | ə |
| sŭm 'sense of touch' | ʔ | ʔ |
| sŭre- 'smear' | ʔ | ʔ |
| sŭrtńe- 'trip, tumble' | ŭ | ə |
| sŭwəce- 'shell (nuts)' | | |
| šŭc 'soot' | ʔ | ʔ |
| šŭdəkš 'barrel hoop' | **ü** | **ü** |
| šŭdər 'spindle' | ŭ | ə |
| šŭgə 'bark beetle' | ʔ | ʔ |
| šŭm 'heart' | ŭ | ʔ |
| šŭm 'scale' | ŭ | ə |
| šŭrgə 'cheeks, face' | ŭ | ʔ |
| šŭrgə 'forest' | | |
| šŭrtə 'yarn' | ŭ | ʔ |
| šŭška- 'stuff' | | |
| šŭštə 'leather' | ʔ | ʔ |
| šŭwala- 'spit' | ŭ | ə |
| tŭŋ 'base' | ŭ | ə |
| tŭr 'edge; blade' | ŭ | ə |
| tŭreda- 'harvest' | ŭ | ə |
| tŭrəs 'full' | | |
| tŭrwə 'lip' | ŭ | ʔ |
| tŭrwənca- 'sneeze' | ŭ | ə |
| tŭška 'group (of people), herd' | ʔ | ə |
| tŭwət 'entirely' | | |
| tŭžem 'thousand' | ŭ | ə |
| ŭdər 'girl, daughter' | ŭ | ə |
| ŭśkərt 'stubborn' | ʔ | ʔ |
| ŭštə 'belt' | ŭ | ʔ |
| ŭźgar 'thing' | ʔ | **ü** |
| ŭžəwər 'common swift' | ʔ | ʔ |
| wŭčə 'cut, notch' | | |
| wŭl- 'on, up, over' | | |
| wŭl/ľə 'mare' | ŭ | ə |
| wŭr 'blood' | ŭ | ə |
| wŭrgeńə 'copper' | ü | ə |
| wŭt 'water' | ŭ | ə |
| wŭteľə 'snipe' | ʔ | ʔ |

*Markus Juutinen*
University of Oulu

# Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami

The distribution of the Russian loan vocabulary within the Saami languages centers on Skolt, Akkala, Kildin, and Ter Saami. In Skolt Saami, this loanword stratum forms the largest loanword stratum and contains more than 750 lexemes. Despite the significance of the loanword stratum, there has hardly been any actual analysis of the Russian loanwords in the Saami languages. This paper aims to fill this gap by presenting an overview of Russian vocabulary in Skolt Saami from a phonological, morphological, and semantic point of view. Besides analyzing the loanwords, approximately 150 new loan etymologies are discussed and some thirty new comparisons with Russian loanwords proposed in other Saami languages. It turns out that the Russian loan lexicon is relatively recent, and most if not all the words were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian between the beginning of the 17th century and 1920. Semantically the vocabulary is heterogenous. The most important semantic categories include religion, clothing, buildings and houses, diet, as well as administration and society.

## 1. Introduction

The Saami languages are usually divided into either two or three areal language groups based on phonological and morphological innovations. In both of these divisions, the border between the eastern and western or the eastern and northwestern branches lies between North Saami and Aanaar (Inari) Saami (e.g. Sammallahti 1998: 6–7; Aikio 2012: 76–77; for more specific details on the division of language groups, see Rydving 2013: 27–61). However, based on vocabulary, Aanaar Saami could be classified as a transitional language between eastern and western branches or even as the easternmost language of the western branch, as the lexical differences between Aanaar Saami and Skolt Saami are greater than the differences between Aanaar Saami and North Saami (Rydving 2013; Tillinger 2014). The lexical differences can mostly be explained by different contact languages. For example, the most important contact language of Aanaar Saami has been Finnish, while for the Saami languages spoken to the east of Aanaar Saami it has been Russian (see e.g. Lehtiranta & Seurujärvi-Kari 1991: 132).

The distribution of the Russian loan vocabulary within the Saami languages centers on Skolt, Akkala, Kildin and Ter Saami. In these languages, the Russian vocabulary forms the largest single loanword stratum (KKLS XX; Rießler 2022: 237), containing totally more than one thousand loanwords. However, there are only a small number of Russian loanwords in the Saami languages spoken to the west of Skolt Saami. For example, only some forty Russian loanwords have been presented in Aanaar Saami, mainly in the dictionary of Skolt and Kola Saami by Itkonen (hereinafter referred to as KKLS) and the dictionary of Aanaar Saami (InLpW), and even less in North Saami and the Saami languages spoken to the west of it. Moreover, a more accurate analysis of the presented Russian loanwords shows them to actually be Karelian loanwords.

In Skolt Saami and in the Saami languages more general, the Russian loanwords represent a relatively recent stratum. Even though the ancestors of Skolt Saami had at least seasonal contacts with the Russian-speaking population in the first centuries of the second millennium and some Russian loanwords were probably borrowed already then, most of the Russian loanwords must have been borrowed after the early 16th century. The close contacts between the Skolt Saami and the Russians began in the 1530s, when the monastery at Pechenga was founded in order to evangelize the Saami of the Kola Peninsula. The Russian influence on Skolt Saami

language and culture continued until the contacts between the Skolt Saami of Paččjokk (in Finnish Paatsjoki), Peäccam (in Finnish Petsamo) and Suõʹnnʼjel (in Finnish Suonikylä) and the Russian contacts broke down in 1920, when the Skolt Saami of those siidas became Finnish citizens and Finnish became the most important contact language instead of Russian. However, the Skolt Saami of Mueʹtǩǩ (in Finnish known as Muotka and in Russian Мотка), Njuõʹttjäuʹrr (Finnish Nuortijärvi, Russian Нотозеро) and Sââʹrvesjäuʹrr (Finnish Hirvasjärvi, Russian Гирвасозеро) became citizens of the Soviet Union and mostly assimilated linguistically during the 20th century.

As most Finno-Ugric languages are spoken in Russia, Russian loanwords in different languages have been studied relatively extensively. For example, there are monographs dealing with the Russian loanwords of Komi (Kalima 1911) and Mari (Savatkova 1969) and the Slavic vocabulary of various stages of the Finnic languages has also been the subject of several studies (see e.g. Mikkola 1894; 1938; Kalima 1952; Plöger 1973; Ojanen 1985; Must 2000; Jarva 2003; Blokland 2009; Tavi 2018; and more specifically Jarva 2003: 38–44; Saarikivi 2009 and Kallio & Laakso 2020). In comparison, the Russian loan vocabulary in the Saami languages has been little studied. The present paper aims to fill this gap for Skolt Saami.

This paper aims to present an overview of Russian vocabulary in Skolt Saami from a phonological, morphophonological, morphological and semantic point of view. I answer the following research questions: 1) From which Russian variant has the vocabulary been borrowed? 2) How have the Russian nouns, verbs and adjectives been adapted to Skolt Saami? 3) Which semantic fields do the loanwords of Russian origin concern, and what do they tell us about the contacts between the Skolt Saami and the Russians?

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Previous studies

The most important source for studying the Russian loanwords in the Saami languages is KKLS. In this work, about 930 Russian loanwords in Skolt, Kildin and Ter Saami are presented. Some of these etymologies were presented already earlier (cf. Itkonen 1916; 1948: I, 164), while only a relatively small number of new Russian loanwords have been presented since then, mainly in the dictionary by Eliseev and Zajceva (2007) which

presents about fifty new Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami and somewhat more in the other eastern Saami languages. Besides representing loan sources, there has hardly been any actual analysis of the Russian loans in the Saami languages.

There are probably only three studies focusing solely on the Russian loanwords in the Saami languages and only two of them deal also with Skolt Saami. Both studies are sorely incomplete. The first and only study focusing exclusively on Skolt Saami is Senkevič-Gudkova's (1971) paper on the phonological structure of Russian loanwords in the Njuõ′ttjäu′rr dialect of Skolt Saami. The second study is the master's thesis of Starowicz (1983), in which he studies the Russian loan vocabulary presented by Itkonen from two perspectives: the phonological equivalence of Russian loans within the Skolt and Kola Saami languages and their loan sources, as well as the semantic fields of loanwords (see Section 5).

In addition to the studies mentioned above, there are two other studies which deal with the Russian loanwords alongside other languages also in Skolt Saami: the comparative-onomasiological dialectal dictionary of Karelian, Vepsian and the Saami languages spoken in the Kola Peninsula by Eliseev and Zajceva (2007) and a paper studying the sound substitutions of the Russian loanwords in the dialects of Karelian, Vepsian and the Saami languages spoken in the Kola Peninsula (Mixajlova 2019), which is based on the dictionary by Eliseev and Zajceva. Although the Russian loanwords of Skolt Saami are not known to have been further studied, the Russian loanwords in Kildin Saami have been examined in some studies (e.g. Szabó 1987; Rießler 2009a; 2009b).

Although in the contacts between the Saami and the Russians, Russian has been the prestige language from which vocabulary has been borrowed into the Saami languages, there are some 120 words borrowed from the Saami languages into Russian (KKLS XX). These items mainly consist of words related to Arctic nature and reindeer husbandry and mostly appear only in the Russian dialects spoken on the Kola Peninsula. However, some words are also widespread in Russian, such as *морж* 'walrus' and *тундра* 'tundra', cf. Skolt Saami *moršš* 'walrus', *tuȭddâr* ~ Kildin Saami *tùndar* 'fell (mountain)' (KKLS 613). The Saami loanwords in Russian have been studied by Itkonen (1932) and Pineda (2004).

It has also been pointed out in various studies (see e.g. Korhonen 1981: 52–55; Sammallahti 1998: 130) that part of the Russian-origin vocabulary of the Saami languages was, in fact, borrowed from Karelian. These words have

been listed separately in studies concerning the contacts between the Saami of the Kola Peninsula and the Karelians (Itkonen 1942; Korhonen 1977), but there has hardly been any actual analysis of this loanword stratum either.

## 2.2. Research materials and notation

The research materials used in this paper can be divided into three parts: the dictionary of Skolt and Kola Saami (KKLS), the comparative-onomasiological dialectal dictionary of Karelian, Vepsian and the Saami languages spoken in the Kola Peninsula (Eliseev & Zajceva 2007), and the Finnish–Skolt Saami dictionary (Moshnikoff & Moshnikoff 2020). From these dictionaries I have collected more than 750 Russian loanwords found in Skolt Saami, which are listed in the appendix. Most of these etymologies were proposed in various studies earlier, mainly in KKLS, but Eliseev & Zajceva present some fifty etymologies of their own. In this study I shall discuss approximately 150 new loan etymologies which have not been previously proposed for any Saami language, and some thirty new comparisons with Russian loanwords proposed in other Saami languages, mainly in Kildin Saami. Since the Russian loanwords represent a relatively recent stratum, they are fairly easy to distinguish on the basis of sound and word structure as well as semantics.

The KKLS is a dialect dictionary based on materials collected mostly in the early twentieth century in the traditional areas where Skolt Saami, Kildin Saami and Ter Saami were spoken. However, based on the KKLS it is not possible to determine the exact number of Russian loanwords in different dialects. The reason for this is that the dictionary is based on relatively short-term fieldwork, during which it was not possible to collect all the vocabulary of the respective dialects. In addition, the dictionary is quite uneven in terms of dialects. Most of the material is from the Paččjokk dialect, and quite a lot from the Njuõʹttjäuʹrr dialect, but there is much less material from the Suõʹnnʼjel dialect and even less from the other dialects. However, these differences do not fully explain why more Russian loanwords are found in the Paččjokk dialect (KKLS XX) than in other dialects, but also differences in contact situations have to be taken into account (see 2.3).

The comparative-onomasiological dialectal dictionary by Eliseev and Zajceva (2007) includes material from the Tuållam (in Russian Тулома) dialect of Skolt Saami, which is a successor of the Njuõʹttjäuʹrr dialect. The

materials were collected in the late 1970s for the *Atlas Linguarum Europae* research project (see Rydving 2013: 93–107).

The Finnish–Skolt Saami dictionary by Moshnikoff and Moshnikoff (2020) is based on the Finnish–Skolt Saami dictionary by Sammallahti and Moshnikoff (1991), in addition to which it contains other vocabulary from the Skolt Saami spoken in Čeʹvetjäuʹrr (in Finnish Sevettijärvi) and a great deal of neologisms created for the written language. Some words in KKLS, especially from the Suõʹnnʹjel dialect, that were excluded from the previous dictionary, are now included.

I have excluded the Finnish–Skolt Saami dictionary by Matti Sverloff (1989) from the research materials of present paper, because the orthography used in it is too inaccurate for a phonological analysis, and it seems that some of the Russian loanwords have been taken directly from dictionaries of Russian, so they are not suitable for this study. Usage of Russian dictionaries is indicated by the fact that the dictionary by Sverloff contains loans that are implausible for semantic reasons, such as *tramvajkjein* 'tramway' (Sverloff 1989: 67) < *трамвáй* 'tramway, tram' and *pojálka* 'grand piano' (Sverloff 1989: 20) < *роя́ль* id. In the latter example, the use of Russian dictionaries is further indicated by the fact that the plosive [p] corresponds to the Russian trill [r], apparently due to the confusion caused by the Cyrillic letter ‹р›.

More Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami can be found on the archive tapes, especially among the material collected in the former Soviet Union and today Russia, but also among the material collected in Finland in the 1960s and 1970s. In this study I have not included materials from archives, since it would have taken a great deal of time and the aim of this study is not to represent all Russian loanwords found in Skolt Saami, but rather only to give an overview of this loanword stratum.

For the sake of clarity, the example words presented in this study are taken from the Finnish–Skolt Saami dictionary (Moshnikoff & Moshnikoff 2020). Only if a word example is not included in the dictionary it is taken from the KKLS, followed by an indicator of the source dialect (P = Paččjokk, S = Suõʹnnʹjel, Nj = Njuõʹttjäuʹrr). If a loan etymology has been proposed earlier in the KKLS or in the dictionary by Eliseev and Zajceva (2007), the reference to the former source is presented after the meaning of the example word. However, if the example word is not presented from Skolt Saami but only from some other Saami language, the word is equated with the notation (~KKLS).

If not mentioned otherwise, I have presented the Russian words according to the modern Russian spelling rules, as the dictionaries of North-western Russian dialects (Myznikov 2010; Durov 2011) lack much of the vocabulary studied in this paper, and the spelling in Russian dialect dictionaries sometimes poorly describes the actual dialectal pronunciation. For the Russian words, I have marked only the meanings corresponding to the meanings of the Skolt Saami words. If the meaning of a Skolt Saami word refers to a meaning found only in Russian dialects, I have presented the dialect dictionary source, too.

## 2.3. History of contacts between Skolt Saami and Russian

The ancestors of the Skolt Saami became acquainted with Russian culture and vocabulary initially through the Karelians. The Karelians had probably been visiting the Kola Peninsula as tax collectors and traders even before the 11th century and they continued to tax the Saami under Novgorod until the 15th century (Itkonen 1948: I, 30). As evidence that the Karelians collected tax among the Skolt Saami, we can mention the Karelian loanword *teä'ǧǧ* 'money' (KKLS 587) < Kar. *tenka* id. < *дéньга* id. The ancestors of the Skolt Saami also became acquainted with Christianity through the Karelians, as evidenced by numerous religious words, such as *risttâd* 'baptize' < Kar. *ristie* id., *rosttov* 'Christmas' < Kar. *rostuva* id. < *Рождество* id. and *veârr* 'faith' < Kar. *viero* id. < *вéра* 'trust' (Itkonen 1942: 53; 1948: I, 83).

At least seasonal contacts between the ancestors of the Skolt Saami and the Russians began in the early Middle Ages, as evidenced by the fact that Kola is mentioned in Russian sources as fishing grounds as early as 1263 (Itkonen 1918b: 36). Because of the contacts between the Skolt Saami and the Russians, the ancestors of the Skolt Saami supposedly widely spoke Russian already in the Middle Ages.

Closer contacts between the ancestors of the Skolt Saami and the Russians began in the early 16th century when the Orthodox Church wanted to secure its hold in the northern part of present-day Russia, also on the Kola Peninsula. In the 1530s, the monastery of Pechenga was founded with the purpose of evangelizing the Saami of the Kola Peninsula. The monastery was destroyed by the Finns a few decades later, after which the activities of the monastery moved to the vicinity of the fortress of Kola, which was founded in the 1550s. Due to the presence of the town of Kola and other Russian settlements, the Russian influence was stronger in coastal

areas than inland, where there were no permanent Russian settlements, only some hermits. For this reason, evangelization progressed slowly inland (see e.g. Granö & Itkonen 1918: 73–74; Itkonen 1918a: 34; 1948: I, 83–84). In the late 17th century, the Skolt Saami of Suõ′nn′jel were mentioned in Russian documents as newly baptized, and in the 19th century Finnish linguists still noted the syncretism of Skolt Saami religious customs (Itkonen 1948: I, 84–85; Castrén 2019: 353–354). However, the monastery's influence was felt inland otherwise, as the monks acquired rights to the best fishing grounds of the Suõ′nn′jel and Njuõ′ttjäu′rr, by partly buying those rights and partly obtaining them with false documents, which led the Skolt Saami to complain to the Tsar in Moscow in 1697, after which they got their territory back (Mikkola 1941: 61–65, 70; Itkonen 1948: I, 84). By the early 19th century, small churches had been built in all Skolt Saami villages, but priests rarely visited these remote villages (Itkonen 1948: I, 84–85; Castrén 2019: 353). At the end of the 19th century, church schools were also built in many winter villages (Granö & Itkonen 1918: 74).

The Skolt Saami also met with Russian public servants, as they had to pay taxes, attend meetings in the town of Kola and transport public servants between villages free of charge, which is mentioned in Russian sources as early as the 17th century (Mikkola 1941: 16–17, 30, 50). Since there were no roads on the Kola Peninsula before the beginning of the 20th century, travel took place mainly along waterways throughout the year (Itkonen & Granö 1918: 47–48). A particularly important route ran from Kandalaksha to Kola close to the Njuõ′ttjäu′rr Skolt Saami area. This route was used by large numbers of Russian-speaking fishermen when they traveled to fish for the summer on the northern coast of the Kola Peninsula, from where they returned for the winter via the same route to the White Sea coast (Lönnrot 1902b: 76, 85–88, 92, 96; Castrén 2019: 370–376, 382).

In addition to ecclesiastical life and administration, the Skolt Saami had contacts with the Russians also through trade, for example. A particularly important place for trade was the town of Kola (Mikkola 1941: 17, 42; Itkonen 1948: II, 212). In the 1830s for example, according to Lönnrot (1902a: 372–373), the Saami from all around the Kola Peninsula went on trading journeys 3–4 times in the winter.

In 1920, under the treaty of Tartu, the Skolt Saami area was divided between Finland and Soviet Russia so that the Skolt Saami of Pač̌čjokk, Peäccam and Suõ′nn′jel became Finnish citizens and the Skolt Saami of Mue′tǩǩ, Njuõ′ttjäu′rr and Sââ′rvesjäu′rr became Soviet-Russian citizens.

The Njauddâm (Näätämö) Skolt Saami village had been separated from the other Skolt Saami villages in the early 19th century. In the Petsamo area, contacts between the Skolt Saami and the Russians broke down, and Finnish became the most important contact language instead of Russian (Linkola & Sammallahti 1995: 51–53). However, the Russian language still affected Skolt Saami for decades, albeit less and less over time. Older Skolt Saami knew Russian and used it with each other until at least the 1960s. They spoke Russian, for example, when they did not want the children to understand the conversation (Erkki Lumisalmi, personal communication). For the Skolt Saami who became Soviet citizens, the influence of Russian increased further during the 20th century. Today only a few Skolt Saami in Russia speak Skolt Saami, while in Finland, hardly any Skolt Saami speak Russian.

## 2.4. The Skolt Saami word structure and the sound systems of Skolt Saami and Russian

In the beginning of the following section, I will introduce the Skolt Saami word structure, since it plays a large role in sound substitutions. When words are borrowed from one language to another, words are adapted to the word structure of the receiving language. However, the rules of adaptation may change over time. After discussing the word structure, I will introduce the sound systems of Skolt Saami and Russian. Since most of the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian, which are spoken on the coastal region of the Kola Peninsula, it is relevant for this study to introduce also the most distinguishing phonological features of these dialects.

Skolt Saami words comprise one or more syllables. The maximal length of a syllable is CCCVCC, but that is rare (see Koponen et al. 2022: 200). It is found, for instance, in *straŋgg* 'iron wire' < *streng* 'string' borrowed from Norwegian.

Skolt Saami words can also be divided into one or more feet (or stress groups) containing one or more syllables. In Skolt Saami the maximal foot is disyllabic and can contain the following parts: C0 (initium), V1 (vowel center), C1 (consonant center), V2 (latus), C2 (finis). C0, C1 and C2 may be either single consonants or consonant clusters and C1 may also be a geminate. V1 may be a monophthong or a diphthong, V2 only a monophthong. Russian loanwords are adapted to the Skolt Saami foot structure

according to following rules: when the word ends in a vowel preceded by a single consonant, the final vowel forms a foot of its own (V1), as in *truub|a* 'chimney' and *trååik|a* 'three-piece suit'. If the word's final vowel is preceded by a consonant cluster, then the border between the feet is set between the consonants, e.g. *lampat|ka* 'altar lamp' < *лампатка* id., *poteâš|ka* 'suspender' (KKLS 399) < *подтяжка* id. The oldest such vowel-ending nouns are borrowed from Russian (see Section 4.1). If a one-foot word ends in C1, an overshort vowel may be heard after it, although it is not written in the modern orthography, e.g. *peehl ~ pēχлᵃ* (S) 'peel' (KKLS 364) < *пехло́* id. However, the overshort vowel is not considered a full vowel, instead it should be understood as a signal showing the end of a foot. The overshort vowel can also be heard in the case where C1 is the last component of the first foot and the second foot begins with C0 (Rueter & Koponen 2016: 261–264; Koponen et al. 2022: 200–201), e.g. *prå′šš|jōõttâd ~ prošš⌐|jȍ̀ᵊttɒ* 'say goodbye' (KKLS 402) < *прощáться* id. Examples of the foot structure of Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Skolt Saami word structure adapted to Russian loanwords

| One Foot | Two Feet |
|---|---|
| *ceerkav* 'church' (C0V1C1V2C2) | *blaus|lõv* 'blessing' (C0V1C1|C0V1C1) |
| *uu′lec* 'street' (V1C1V2C2) | *gruuž|a* 'pear' (C0V1C1|V1) |
| *attu* hell.SG.ILL (V1C1V2) | *buk|va* 'letter' (C0C1|C0V1) |
| *uuss* 'mustache' (V1C1) | *voroŋ|ka* 'funnel' (C0V1C1|C0V1) |
| | *bäinn|õõttâd* 'take a sauna' (C0V1C1|V1C1V2C2) |

In Skolt Saami a word-initial sequence of two consonants is somewhat common and is found already in Scandinavian loanwords older than the Russian loanword stratum. A word-initial sequence of three consonants is much rarer, restricted mainly to the Russian loans, e.g. *strääšnai* 'terrible' < *стрáшный* id., as well as recent loans like *stre′ss* 'stress' < Finnish *stressi* id. Unlike for example in Mansi (Bakró-Nagy 2018) or in Finnish (Plöger 1973: 269–270), in which the word-initial consonant clusters of Russian loanwords have most often been simplified in one way or another, the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami have almost always preserved the word-initial consonant clusters. There are only few exceptions to this, e.g. *rååslai* 'robust' (KKLS 450) < *взрóслый* 'adult'. Also, the word-initial consonant cluster *кв-* has been simplified, e.g. *vä′šnn* 'sourdough'

(KKLS 724) < *квашня́* 'kneading trough', cf. Tavi (2018: 337), but there are only two examples of this.

In Skolt Saami, the main stress is always on the V1 vowel in the first foot of a word; the other feet have a weak or strong secondary stress on the V1 vowel and all the V2 vowels have weak secondary stress, while the overshort vowels are unstressed (Korhonen 1973: 25–26; Koponen et al. 2022: 201). This is true also in the Russian loanwords. Conversely, in Russian the word stress can appear in any syllable and the stress can vary between different inflectional forms (Timberlake 2004: 29).

The consonant systems of Skolt Saami and Russian largely correspond to each other, as shown in Tables 2 and 3 where the consonant phonemes that exist in both languages are set in bold. In both languages, the plosives, sibilants and labiodental fricatives occur in pairs separated by whether a consonant is voiced (+) or voiceless (−). However, unlike in Skolt Saami, there is no voice opposition of the affricates or velar fricatives in Russian. In addition to the place of articulation, manner of articulation and voicing, also palatalization must be taken into account when analyzing the consonants of Skolt Saami and Russian. In Russian, most consonants come in phoneme pairs that differ by palatalization (Timberlake 2004: 28–29). The Russian non-palatalized and palatalized consonant phonemes are marked in the same cell in the Table 3 even though they are different phonemes. In Skolt Saami, however, palatalization can be analyzed as a suprasegmental phoneme which affects both consonants and vowels in a palatalized foot. In Skolt Saami consonants are palatalized if they were historically followed by a front vowel in the same foot. Unlike in Skolt Saami, there are no palatal plosives, dental fricative, palatal, or velar nasals, nor a palatal lateral in Russian.

The word-medial voiced plosives *b*, *d* and *g*, e.g. *cuâbb* 'frog', *lå'dd* 'bird', *jiõgg* 'spirit', as well as the voiced sibilants *z* and *ž*, e.g. *põõssâd* 'wash' : *põõzzam* [PRS.1SG], *põõššâd* 'stay' : *põõžžam* [PRS.1SG], occur in the Skolt Saami lexicon older than the Russian loan stratum. Even though, unlike for example Karelian (Sarhimaa 1995: 212), Skolt Saami has not received any new consonant phonemes from Russian loanwords, it should be mentioned that the voiced plosives *b*, *d* and *g*, e.g. *Bååžž* 'God (children's language)' < *Бóже* 'God', *dåållat* 'chisel' (KKLS 26) < *долотó* id., *gåårad* 'town' (KKLS 34) < *гóрод* id., as well as the voiced sibilants *z* and *ž*, e.g. *zo'ntič̌* 'umbrella' < *зóнтик* id., *žaar* 'fever, steam in sauna, heat' (KKLS 565) < *жар* id. have become possible in word-initial position along with the Russian loanwords.

Table 2: The Skolt Saami consonant system (Korhonen 1971: 83; Feist 2015: 45; Koponen et al. 2022: 199)

| | Bila-bial | Labio-dental | Den-tal | Alve-olar | Post-alveolar | Alveolo-palatal | Pal-atal | Velar |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| voicing | − + | + − | + | − + | − + | − + | − + | − + |
| Stop | **p** **b** ⟨p⟩ ⟨b⟩ | | | **t** **d** ⟨t⟩ ⟨d⟩ | | | **ḱ** **ǵ** ⟨ǩ⟩ ⟨ǧ⟩ | **k** **g** ⟨k⟩ ⟨g⟩ |
| Nasal | **m** ⟨m⟩ | | | **n** ⟨n⟩ | | | ń ⟨nj⟩ | ŋ ⟨ŋ⟩ |
| Trill | | | | **r** ⟨r⟩ | | | | |
| Fricative | | **v** **f** ⟨v, u⟩ ⟨f⟩ | δ ⟨đ⟩ | **s** **z** ⟨s⟩ ⟨z⟩ | **š** **ž** ⟨š⟩ ⟨ž⟩ | | **j** ⟨j, i⟩ | **x** γ ⟨h⟩ ⟨g⟩ |
| Affricate | | | **ts** ⟨c⟩ | dz ⟨ʒ⟩ | | **tš** dž ⟨č⟩ ⟨ǯ⟩ | | |
| Approximant | | | | | | | **j** ⟨i⟩ | |
| Lateral | | | | **l** ⟨l⟩ | | | **ľ** ⟨llj⟩ | |

Table 3: Standard Russian consonant system (Timberlake 2004: 52)

| | Bilabial | Labio-dental | Dental | (Alveo-)palatal | Velar |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| voicing | − + | + − | − + | − + | − + |
| Stop | **p** ⟨п⟩ **b** ⟨б⟩<br>ṕ b | | **t** ⟨т⟩ **d** ⟨д⟩<br>t́ d́ | | **k** ⟨к⟩ **g** ⟨г⟩<br>ḱ ǵ |
| Nasal | **m** ⟨м⟩<br>ḿ | | **n** ⟨н⟩<br>ń | | |
| Trill | | | **r** ⟨р⟩<br>ŕ | | |
| Fricative | | **v** ⟨в⟩ **f** ⟨ф⟩<br>v́ f | **s** ⟨с⟩ **z** ⟨з⟩<br>ś ź | **š** ⟨ш⟩ **ž** ⟨ж⟩<br>š́ ⟨щ⟩ | **x** ⟨х⟩<br>x́ |
| Affricate | | | **ts** ⟨ц⟩ | **tš** ⟨ч⟩ | |
| Approximant | | | | **j** ⟨й⟩ | |
| Lateral | | | **l** ⟨л⟩<br>ľ | | |

One of the most distinguishing features of the consonants of Northern Russian dialects is the reflex of the Proto-Slavic voiced plosive *g. In the Southern dialects, Proto-Slavic *g is pronounced as a voiced velar fricative [ɣ] in word-initial and word-medial positions, as in *головá* [ɣolová] 'head' and *дрýга* [druɣa] friend.SG.GEN, and as a voiceless velar fricative [x] in word-final position, as in *друг* [drux] 'friend'. In the Northern dialectal group *g is pronounced as a voiced plosive [g] in word-initial and word-medial positions, as in [golová] and [druga], and as a voiceless plosive [k] in word-final position, as in [druk]. (For more on this, see Kasatkin 1989: 200–205.) The Northern dialects of Russian are further divided into several subdialects, one of which is the Northwestern dialectal group, also referred to in some contexts as the Pomor dialects, as many speakers of these dialects call themselves Pomors. These dialects are spoken in the northern parts of Arkhangelsk Oblast, the Republic of Karelia, Vologda Oblast, and in the southern parts of the Kola Peninsula. One of the most distinguishing consonantal features of these dialects is the so-called soft *tsokanye*, which means that the Russian affricates ‹ч› and ‹ц› have merged and are pronounced as a palatalized affricate [tś], as in *честь* [tśesť] 'honor' and *пéрец* [ṕeŕetś] 'pepper' vs. Standard Russian [tšesť] and [ṕeŕets]. (See e.g. Post 2005: 50–61 and more specifically Merkur′jev 1960; 1962.)

There are nine to ten vowels and ten to twelve diphthongs in Skolt Saami according to various grammar descriptions as shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4: Skolt Saami vowels in the first syllable (Korhonen 1971: 74–76; Feist 2015: 64–77; Koponen et al. 2022: 197–198)

|  | Front | Central | Back |
|---|---|---|---|
| Close | i ‹i› |  | u ‹u› |
| Close-mid | e ‹e› | ɘ ‹õ› | o ‹o› |
| Open-mid | (ɛ ‹ẹ›) | ɐ ‹â› | ɔ ‹å› |
| Open | ä ‹ä› |  | a ‹a› |

Table 5: Skolt Saami diphthongs in the first syllable (Korhonen 1971: 74–76; Feist 2015: 70–75; Koponen et al. 2022: 198)

| | |
|---|---|
| ie̯ ‹iõ› | uo̯ ‹uõ› |
| ie ‹ie′› | uo ‹ue′› |
| iɐ ‹iâ› | uɐ ‹uâ› |
| eɛ ‹eâ› | uɛ ‹uâ› |
| eä ‹eä› | oa ‹uä› |
| (iɛ ‹iẹ′›) | (uɛ ‹uẹ′›) |

The vowels in the unstressed syllables are shown in Table 6. The monophthongs *å*, *ä* or *õ* or diphthongs have not traditionally been present in syllables without main or secondary stress. Syllables with secondary stress have the same monophthong phonemes as the second syllable of the foot,

in addition to which some diphthongs may also be present (Korhonen 1971: 79–82; Koponen et al. 2022: 198).

Table 6: Skolt Saami vowels in unstressed syllables (Korhonen 1971: 79–81; Koponen et al. 2022: 198).

|  | Front | Central | Back |
|---|---|---|---|
| Close | i ‹i› |  | u ‹u› |
| Close-mid | e ‹e› |  | (o ‹o›) |
| Open-mid |  | a̠ ‹â› |  |
| Open |  |  | a ‹a› |

As shown in Table 7, the Standard Russian has five to six vowel phonemes according to various grammar descriptions.

Table 7: Standard Russian vowel system (Timberlake 2004: 29–41)

|  | Front | Central | Back |
|---|---|---|---|
| Close | i ‹и› | (i̠ ‹ы›) | u ‹у› |
| Mid | e ‹e› |  | o ‹o› |
| Open |  | a ‹a› |  |

The most distinguishing feature in the vowels of the Northern Russian dialects is probably the absence of vowel reduction of ‹o›, which means that this vowel is pronounced as [o] even in unstressed syllables, as in *окнó* [oknó] 'window'. This absence of vowel reduction is a feature known as *okanye*. In the Southern and Central dialect groups as well as in Standard Russian, the vowel is reduced in unstressed syllables, as in [aknó] 'window', which is called *akanye* (see Kasatkin 1989: 200–205). Yet another Northwestern Russian dialectal feature which should be mentioned is that, unlike in Standard Russian and in the Southern dialects of Russian, in the Northwestern dialects the stressed vowels are not always singled out by length (Post 2005: 43–46).

It should also be noted that the Northwestern dialects of Russian have borrowed some vocabulary from Standard Russian, Southern dialects of Russian, and Church Slavonic, which is why in some cases it is difficult to decide from which source the word was borrowed into Skolt Saami.

## 3. Sound substitutions

In this section, the Russian loanwords of Skolt Saami are studied from the perspective of sound substitutions. Sound substitution is understood in this paper as the process by which a source-language sound is substituted with the phonetically closest phoneme of the target language. Such sound substitution applies to both single sounds and sound combinations, and the substituting rules may change depending on the time of the contact situation. In the first subsection we will determine from what Russian variant the loanwords were borrowed into Skolt Saami, while in the following subsection, we will see what can be deduced from the Russian loans about the sound changes that have occurred in the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami and the development of the sound system of Skolt Saami in general.

### 3.1. Identification of loan sources

This section deals with phonological factors that can be used to determine the language source from which the words were borrowed into Skolt Saami. The first subsection deals with consonants and the second with vowels.

### 3.1.1. Consonants

In this section I will study the Russian voiced plosive ‹г› and affricate ‹ч› as they are represented in loanwords in Skolt Saami. As shown in Section 2.4, these consonants are pronounced differently in the Standard Russian and in the Northwestern dialects of Russian, so the Skolt Saami substitutions of these consonants can reveal the loan source.

Most often the Russian voiced plosive ‹г› is represented by the Skolt Saami voiced plosive [g] in both word-initial (1–3) and word-medial positions (5, 6). This shows that these words were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian, since in these dialects ‹г› is pronounced as a voiced plosive [g] in word-initial and word-medial positions, not as a voiced velar fricative [ɣ] as in the Southern dialects of Russian.

(1)     *godovai* 'annual' < *годово́й* id.
(2)     *gåårad* 'town' (KKLS 34) < *го́род* id.
(3)     *groom* 'thunder (sound)' < *гром* id.

(4)   *dragaceânnai* 'precious (on stones)' < *драгоце́нный* id.

(5)   *kruugg* 'circle' (KKLS 873) < *круг* id.

(6)   *uuggâr* 'carbon monoxide' (KKLS 698) < *уга́р* id.

Among the research material, there are also words in which the word-medial plosive ‹г› is represented by the Skolt Saami voiceless velar fricative [x] (7–9). In *blouslōv* 'blessing' (KKLS 24) < *благословѣ́ние* id. the fricative has further weakened and been changed into a vowel after the loss of the second-syllable vowel. Since these words belong to the religious vocabulary, which have largely been borrowed to the Russian dialects from Standard Russian or Church Slavonic (cf. Kalima 1952: 65), the representation of ‹г› in Skolt Saami does not reveal the loan source.

(7)   *bohat* 'rich' (KKLS 24) < *бога́т* id. (cf. Kalima 1952: 138–139)

(8)   *bo'htter* 'hero, giant' (KKLS 24) < *богаты́рь* id.

(9)   *sloovboh* 'thank God' < *сла́ва Бо́гу* id.

However, since *Vuâsppå'd* 'God' (KKLS 796) is the only word in which the Russian word initial ‹г› (*Госпо́д* id.) is represented as *v* in Skolt Saami, I find it likely that, unlike Kildin Saami *gospoᵈt* id., *Vuâsppå'd* is not a Russian loan as stated in KKLS. Instead, it represents a Karelian loan from *Hospoti* id., which is a borrowing of Russian *Госпо́д*. The Skolt Saami consonant *v* can be explained by the fact that the Karelian word-initial glottal fricative *h* has been left unsubstituted, as in *algg* 'firewood' < *halko* id., and in Skolt Saami *v*-prothesis has occurred before a word-initial diphthong, as in e.g. *vuei'nned* 'see' and *vuei'vv* 'head', cf. North Saami *oaidnit* 'see' and *oaivi* 'head'.

There are also a few Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami in which the Skolt Saami voiced velar fricative [ɣ] corresponding to the Russian word-medial voiced plosive ‹г› cannot be explained by a fricative in Russian, but rather by a phonological rule in Skolt Saami. In the Russian loanwords a consonant cluster ‹гр› and ‹гл› has been substituted by the clusters *gr* and *gl*, respectively, as in (10–11), and in the word (12) the velar fricative has developed even further to a vowel. This is understandable, inasmuch as in Skolt Saami a word-medial consonant cluster *gr* occurs only in recent loanwords such as *agressiivlaž* 'aggressive' < Finnish *aggressiivinen* id. and *programm* 'program', cf. English *program*. In the word *pogoda* 'snowstorm' (13) the plosive has developed as a voiced velar fricative between vowels, as in

*puägganj* [pǒǎɣɣań] 'belt' and *pogsted* 'laugh', cf. North Saami *boagán* 'belt' and *boagustit* 'laugh'.

(10) *ooglâm* 'tiller (in a boat)' (KKLS 313) < *оглóбля* 'shaft'

(11) *poo'grev* 'cellar' (KKLS 390) < *пóгреб* id.

(12) *bàura* (P) 'drag' (KKLS 23) < *багóр* 'boathook' : *багрá* [SG.GEN]

(13) *pogoda* 'snowstorm' (KKLS 390) < *погóда* 'weather'

In most of the words, the Russian affricate ‹ч› is represented in Skolt Saami by the alveolar affricate [ts] (14–19), as is also the Russian affricate ‹ц›, e.g. *ceâlai* 'whole' < *цéлый* id., *pee'rec* 'pepper' < *пéрец* id. and *peä'nec* 'drunken' < *пья́ница* id. This suggests that the words were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian in which the so-called soft *tsokanye* occurs, that is, the pronunciation of both Russian affricates as [tś].

(14) *ceestva* 'gift for church' < *чéствование* 'honoring'

(15) *coolan* 'corner shelf' (KKLS 637) < *чулáн* 'larder'

(16) *trooccâd* 'caress, fondle' (KKLS 611) < *дрочúть* id. (Durov 2011: 106), Standard Russian 'masturbate'

(17) *ku'ccer* 'curl, curly' (KKLS 184) < *кучеря́вый* 'curly'

(18) *pe'ccel* 'sorrow' (KKLS 361) < *печáль* id.

(19) *oobrâc* 'hoop' < *óбруч* id.

There are only a few such words in Skolt Saami in which the Russian affricate ‹ч› is represented in Skolt Saami by the affricate *č* (20–25). Since in every of these words the affricate ‹ч› is pronounced [tś] also in the Northwestern dialects of Russian, e.g. *чáстой* 'dense, close together' (Myznikov 2010: 468) and *чúстить* 'clean, gut fish' (Durov 2011: 440), it is difficult to identify the loan source from which the words were borrowed into Skolt Saami.

(20) *čeâstai* 'dense, close together' < *чáстый* id.

(21) *čiistâd* 'clean' (KKLS 668) < *чúстить* id.

(22) *ǩiirpâč* 'brick' (KKLS 121) < *кирпúч* id.

(23) *pričas* '(Holy) Communion' < *причáстие* id.

(24) *sviičč* 'sacrificial gift' (KKLS 539) < *свечá* 'candle'

(25) *u'čtee'l* 'teacher' (KKLS 703) < *учúтель* id.

### 3.1.2. Vowels

In this section I will study the substitutions of the Russian first-syllable unstressed ‹o› as well as some cases in which the vowel [o] appears in the Northwestern Russian dialects in the place of the Standard Russian ‹a›.

There are only a small number of Russian loanwords in which the first-syllable unstressed vowel ‹o› has been substituted by Skolt Saami [a] (26–30). Also for these words, it is difficult to identify the loan source from which they were borrowed into Skolt Saami, as there are words in the Northwestern dialects of Russian that are borrowed from Standard Russian and from the Southern dialects. In these words the unstressed ‹o› is reduced (see Kalima 1952: 32).

(26)  *manah* 'monk' (KKLS 237) < *монáх* id.

(27)  *manaster* 'monastery' (KKLS 234) < *монасты́рь* id.

(28)  *namster* 'monastery' < *намасты́рь* 'id. (dialectal)' (see Must 2000: 188)

(29)  *sääldat* 'soldier' (KKLS 469) < *солдáт* id.

(30)  *taaurõš* 'comrade' (KKLS 576) < *товáрищ* id.

In most of the loanwords the Russian ‹o› has been substituted by either *o* or *å*, even in unstressed syllables (31–36), which shows that the words were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian, i.e. dialects in which *okanye* occurs, which means that also the unstressed ‹o› is pronounced as the labial vowel [o].

(31)  *mo'lidva* 'prayer' < *моли́тва* id.

(32)  *nozvai(-ree'ppiǩ)* 'handkerchief tissue' (*ree'ppiǩ* 'scarf') (~KKLS 909) < *носовóй* (*платóк*) 'handkerchief' (*платóк* 'scarf')

(33)  *poddnõs* 'tray' < *поднóс* id.

(34)  *måårak̆* 'carrot' < *морко́вь* id.

(35)  *åå'ves* 'oat' (~KKLS 326) < *овёс* id.

(36)  *på'reâd* 'order' < *поря́док* id.

The Northern dialects of Russian have also preserved the original vowel [o] in some words in which ‹a› appears in the Standard Russian (Merkur'jev 1960: 8–9; Must 2000: 521 and the sources mentioned in it). As in the words mentioned above, in these words, too, the vowel has been substituted by either *o* or *å* (37–40), showing that these words were borrowed from North-western dialects of Russian.

(37)  *ròвtȅ̌ššɒɒ* (Nj) 'work' (~KKLS 447) < *рабо́тать* id.

(38)  *rozboineǩ* 'robber' (KKLS 450) < *разбо́йник* id.

(39)  *ståkkan* 'drinking glass' (KKLS 523) < *стака́н* id.

(40)  *zȧȧrad* 'haystack' (KKLS 515) < *заро́д* id.

There are also a small number of words in the Northern dialects of Russian that have [o] in place of etymological [a] (Merkur'jev 1960: 9). The change of vowel was generated by analogy in a situation where the speakers of the Northern dialects were in contact with speakers of Southern dialects (see Kalima 1952: 172). In these cases, too, the vowel is substituted in Skolt Saami by either *o* or *å* (41–45).

(41)  *kårmman* 'pocket' (KKLS 148) < *карма́н* id.

(42)  *rosttvõõrrâd* 'knead' (KKLS 451) < *раствори́ть* 'dissolve'

(43)  *råȧssal* 'seawater' (KKLS 451) < *рассо́л* 'brine'

(44)  *tåralka* 'fish basin' < *таре́лка* 'plate'

(45)  *tȧȧrkan* 'cockroach' (KKLS 608) < *тарака́н* id.

## 3.2. On the dating of some sound changes in Skolt Saami

In this subsection, I study dating criteria of some Skolt Saami sound changes and the dating of the loanwords borrowed from Russian. First, I will deal with denasalization, then with the substitution of the Russian vowel ‹e› in the first syllable and the labial vowel [o] in the second syllable of a foot. Finally, I will briefly present the changes that have taken place in the Skolt Saami consonant system due to Russian loanwords.

In Saami linguistics, denasalization means that clusters of a nasal and a stop or an affricate have turned into geminate half-voiced stops and affricates (\**nᴅ > dd*, \**mʙ > bb*, *ŋɢ > gg*, \**nʒ > ʒʒ*, *ń ǯ̌ > ǯ̌ǯ̌*). Denasalization spread from North Saami to Aanaar Saami probably in the late 16th or early 17th century (Sammallahti 1998: 29, 194), and probably only after that to Skolt Saami. The relatively recent spread of denasalization to Skolt Saami is also indicated by the fact that it has not spread to Akkala Saami, as that Saami variety has preserved clusters of a nasal and a stop/affricate, e.g. Skolt Saami *lå'dd* 'bird' vs. Akkala Saami *lå'ndd* (< Proto-Saami \**loⁿᴅē*). However, in the Russian loanwords the clusters of a nasal and a stop have regularly been preserved (46–48), which indicates that the denasalization was no longer a productive sound change in Skolt Saami when these words were borrowed into the language,

and thus we must assume that most if not all the Russian loanwords were borrowed into Skolt Saami after the beginning of the 17th century.

(46)  *lampatka* 'altar lamp' < *лампа́тка* id.

(47)  *liântt* 'ribbon; tape' (KKLS 210) < *ле́нта* id.

(48)  *fintt* 'screw' (KKLS 32) < *винт* id.

Skolt Saami has many words in which Russian first-syllable ‹e› has been substituted by the Skolt Saami diphthongs *eâ*, *eä*, *iâ* or *ie* (49–52). Apparently, these words belong to an older stratum than those words in which the Russian vowel in question was substituted by a monophthong *e*. In Proto-Saami there was no monophthong *e* in the first syllable (Sammallahti 1998: 43). It seems that this situation also prevailed in connection with the borrowing of the oldest Russian loanwords of Skolt Saami, which is why the Russian first-syllable ‹e› was substituted by diphthongs (see also Korhonen 1981: 97). The quality of a diphthong in the first syllable is determined by the vowel in the second syllable of the foot or the stem vowel (see Koponen et al. 2022: 204–205), although there may be variation of first-syllable diphthongs even with the same vowel in the second syllable, e.g. *kreäppast* 'mortgage deed, fortress' (KKLS 155) < *кре́пость* id. and *neâmmai* 'dumb' < *немо́й* id.

(49)  *meâll* 'chalk' (KKLS 252) < *мел* id.

(50)  *veä'ncc* 'marriage, crown' (KKLS 744) < *вене́ц* 'crown'

(51)  *pliâšš* 'bald' (KKLS 381) < *пле́шь* id.

(52)  *vie'ssel* 'glad' (KKLS 729) < *ве́сел* 'gentle (short masculine)'

There are also quite many loanwords in Skolt Saami in which Russian first-syllable ‹e› is substituted by the Skolt Saami monophthong *e* (53–55). Apparently, these words were borrowed after the *i–e* vowel-height alternation (see Sammallahti 1998: 29; Feist 2015: 90) was developed in Skolt Saami, which made it possible for Skolt Saami to have a first-syllable monophthong *e*. Even though it is difficult to give an exact date when this sound change happened, it must be relatively recent, since it is not found in Aanaar Saami and only to a small extent in Kildin Saami.

(53)  *pee'rec* 'pepper' < *пе́рец* id.

(54)  *steehl* 'glass' (KKLS 521) < *стекло́* id.

(55)  *žee'st* 'metal plate' (KKLS 565) < *жесть* id.

In the old vocabulary of Skolt Saami, the labial vowel *o has lost its round-
ness in the second syllable of a foot and fallen together with a. This sound
change has happened in Skolt Saami relatively recently, as it has not hap-
pened in Aanaar Saami, and it has also affected some secondary cases in
Skolt Saami (Sammallahti 1998: 29). In most cases, in this position the Rus-
sian [o] is reflected by a (56–58) in Skolt Saami. However, unlike in other
vocabulary, sometimes the Russian [o] is reflected by â (59–62). The sound
change seems to have been still active quite recently, as there are some
cases in which there is still a labial vowel in the dialects, but it has lost its
roundness in the standard language. The Skolt Saami standard-language
words *ceerkav* 'church' (KKLS 631) < *цéрковь* id. correspond in the dialects
to *tsèrkov* id. (P, Nj) and *gōroχ* 'pea (pl.)' (Nj), in which a labial vowel still
appears in the second syllable, suggesting that the words must be relatively
recent Russian loans. This is the case with *skoorâd* 'frying pan', which cor-
responds in the dialects to *skōroɒ* (S) ~ *skòuroɒ* (Nj), in which the second-
syllable labial vowel has not lost its roundness in the dialects.

(56)  *kåårab* 'box' (KKLS 148) < *кóроб* id.

(57)  *räädast* 'joy' < *рáдость* id.

(58)  *žäärak* 'burning hot' < *жáрок* 'hot (short masculine)'

(59)  *jaavâl* 'devil' < *дьявол* id.

(60)  *jaakân* 'precentor' < *дья́кон* 'deacon'

(61)  *proostâr* 'loose-fitting' (KKLS 402) < *простóрный* id.

(62)  *skoorâd* 'frying pan' (KKLS 505) < *сковородá* id.


It should also be noted that the loss of roundness of the labial vowel ap-
plies only to the second syllable of a foot. There are also many nouns that
consist of two feet, and the labial vowel begins a new foot (63–66) (on the
structure of nouns, see 4.1.). There are also some words (67, 68) that have
not been adapted to the older prosodic structure of Skolt Saami. In these
cases, a second-syllable labial vowel may appear.

(63)  *gram|fon* 'gramophone' < *граммофóн* id.

(64)  *päär|hå'd* 'steamboat' (KKLS 341) < *парохóд* id.

(65)  *sor|ok* 'magpie' < *сорóка* id.

(66)  *zav|o'd* 'factory' (~KKLS 540) < *завóд* id.

(67)  *pogod|a* 'snowstorm' (KKLS 390) < *погóда* 'weather'

(68)  *voroŋ|ka* 'funnel' < *ворóнка* id.

## 4. Morphological and morphophonological adaption

In this section, I discuss the adaption of nouns, verbs and adjectives on the basis of foot structure (see 2.4). I examine from which inflected forms the words were borrowed, and to which inflectional classes the words have been adapted. In addition, I present some criteria by means of which the various loanword strata can be classified, for example, the presence or absence of consonant gradation is an important dating criterion for both nouns and verbs.

As in many other languages spoken in Russia, a great number of adverbs – *domoi* 'home (motion)' (KKLS 816) < *домóй* id., *dååma* 'at home' (KKLS 816) < *дóма* id., *ei'ddvââ* 'hardly' (KKLS 26) < *едвá* id., *e'pet* 'again' (KKLS 361) < *опя́ть* id., *kråå'ma* 'without' < *крóме* id., *kroota* 'suddenly' < *крýто* id., *možât* 'maybe' (KKLS 261) < *мóжет* id., *naveârna* 'proba-bly' < *навéрно* id., *poka* 'until' < *покá* id., *po·štằi* (P) 'almost' (KKLS 399) < *почтú* id., *saraaz* 'at once' < *зарáз* id., *tå'lǩ* 'if only' (KKLS 604) < *тóлько* 'only' –, conjunctions – *a* 'but' (KKLS 1) < *a* id., *da* 'and' (KKLS 25) < *да* id., *di* 'and' (~KKLS 25) < *да и* id., *hå't* 'at least' (KKLS 42) < *хоть* id., *i* 'and' (KKLS 43) < *и* id., *le'be* 'or' (KKLS 202) < *лúбо* id., *leâša* 'but' (KKLS 196) < *лишь* 'only, as soon as', *seâža* 'anyway, after all' < *всё же* 'after all', *što* 'that' (KKLS 561) < *что* id. – as well as particles – *beâddaa* 'alas!' (KKLS 23) < *бедá* 'misfortune', *davai* 'let's' < *давáй* id., *še* 'also' (KKLS 546) < *же*, *ve't* (KKLS 736) < *ведь*, *vot* 'alright!' (KKLS 760) < *вот* id. – have been borrowed from Russian into Skolt Saami. However, with regard to these, attention can be paid mainly to sound substitutions and not so much to morphological adaption, which is why in this paper I will not consider sep-arately the borrowing of those word classes. However, it should be noted that morphological adaptation has also taken place in some adverbs. For example, the adverb suffix *-s* is connected to the adverb *dååtlas* 'until there' < *дотýль* 'until there' (Durov 2011: 104). The Skolt Saami have apparently been familiar with Russian word derivation, as there are two variants of the adverb *dääras ~ dääram* 'free of charge' < *дáром* id. ← *дар* 'gift', one with the Russian adverb suffix *-ом* (phonologically substituted in Skolt Saami) and one in which the suffix has been changed to the Skolt Saami adverb suffix *-s*, cf. *lääinas* 'as a loan' ← *läinn* 'loan'.

## 4.1. Nouns

Most of the nouns seem to have been borrowed from the Russian nominative singular forms, which is shown by the fact that there are recently borrowed nouns which end in *a* in the nominative singular as they do in Russian, and in which apocope has not taken place in Skolt Saami (69–71). The research material also contains nouns that were borrowed from Russian nominative plural forms. These nouns inflect as plurals in Skolt Saami, too (72–75). The only two words in the material that were clearly not borrowed from the nominative forms are *bàura* (P) 'drag' (KKLS 23) and *šnuura* 'lamp cotton' (~KKLS 559), which may have been borrowed from the Russian vowel-ending genitive singular forms *багра́* and *шнура́* instead of the consonant-ending nominative singular forms *баго́р* 'boathook' and *шнур* 'cord'. However, it is not clear why the genitive singular form would have acted as a loan source.

(69)  *bukva* 'letter' < *бу́ква* id.
(70)  *määma* 'mom' (KKLS 236) < *ма́ма* id.
(71)  *trååika* 'three-piece suit' < *тро́йка* id.
(72)  *laatt* 'armor' (KKLS 197) < *ла́ты* id.
(73)  *noo'slek̆* 'stretcher' (KKLS 286) < *носи́лки* id.
(74)  *saan* 'sleigh' (KKLS 472) < *са́ни* id.
(75)  *suutk* 'twenty-four hours' (KKLS 537) < *су́тки* id.

The nouns of Skolt Saami can be divided into five main inflectional classes (see Koponen et al. 2022: 206–207), of which only three classes include also Russian loanwords.

The first inflectional class has a disyllabic final foot in the locative singular form (*põõrtâst* 'house', *låå'ddest* 'bird', *päällast* 'ball', *nuõrr|vuõđâst* 'youth', *porr|mõõžžâst* 'food', *pee'r|vee'sǩest* 'unmarried Skolt Saami girl's headdress', *dur|aakast* 'idiot') and the final foot of the genitive singular form is monosyllabic (*põõrt*, *låå'dd*, *pääll*, *nuõrr|vuõđ*, *porr|mõõžž*, *pee'r|vee'sǩ*, *dur|aak*). This inflectional class can be further divided into two subclasses according to whether the final foot of the nominative singular form is largo (*põrtt*, *lå'dd*, *päll*, *nuõrr|vuõtt*) or allegro (*porr|mõš*, *pee'r|vesǩ*, *dur|ak*). It is worth noting that in the old lexicon, all the lexemes belonging to this inflectional class, and for which the locative singular form is multisyllabic, are either compound words, e.g. *algg|veärr* 'appetizer'

(*algg* 'beginning' + *veärr* 'food'), *ǩeʹrjj|põrtt* 'library' (*ǩeʹrjj* 'book' + *põrtt* 'house, building'), or contain some derivational suffix, e.g. *porr|mõõžžâst* 'food' < *poorrâd* 'eat', *nuõrr|vuõtt* 'youth' < *nuõrr* 'young', *siltt|õs* 'skill' < *siltteed* 'can, know'.

The second inflectional class consists of nouns in which the final foot of the singular locative form is monosyllabic (*kõnnj|rest* 'elbow', *väll|sest* 'whale', *dåhtt|rest* 'doctor', *päʹʒʒ|lmest* 'pole', *kaʹldd|jest* 'ice hole', *kaaup|šumm|šest* 'selling', *čodd|jest* 'throat', *siõmm|nest* 'seed') and the final foot of the genitive singular form is disyllabic (*kõnnjâr, vällaz, dåhttar, kaʹlddi, kaaup|šummuž, čoddi, seâmman*). This class can be further divided into two subclasses according to whether the final foot of the nominative singular form is disyllabic (*kõõnjâr, vääʹles, dåhttar, pääʹʒʒelm, kaʹlddi, kaaup|šummuš*) or monosyllabic (*čoodd, siõm*), the latter of which does not include any Russian loanwords. In the older lexicon, to this inflectional class belong all nouns consisting in the nominative singular form of one disyllabic foot and not including derivational suffixes, e.g. *võõnâs* 'boat', *kååvas* 'Saami hut'. All these lexemes in the older lexicon undergo consonant gradation (SG.GEN *võnnâz, kåvvaz*).

The third class has a monosyllabic final foot in the locative singular (*säʹmm|last* 'Skolt Saami person', *säʹpp|leest* 'mouse'), genitive singular (*säʹmm|la, säʹpp|lee*) as well as in the nominative singular (*säʹmm|laž, säʹpp|li*). This inflectional class does not include any Russian loanwords.

The fourth class has a disyllabic locative singular (*siiʹdest* 'little village', *paallust* 'little ball', *kuâlast* 'little fish', *säʹmm|lõõʹžžest* 'small Skolt Saami person', *sârvvast* 'male reindeer', *suõllust* 'island') and genitive singular (*siiʹde, paallu, kuâla, säʹmm|lõõʹžže, sârvva, suõllu*). This inflectional class does not include any Russian loanwords, except those which contain a diminutive suffix (*knoopkaž* 'snap' < *кнóпка* id., *kuuhlaž* 'doll' (KKLS 141) < *кýкла* id.) as the majority of nouns belonging to this class (e.g. *siidâž, päällaž, kuâlaž*).

The fifth class consists of nouns ending in a vowel in the nominative singular form (*karsiin|a* 'petroleum', *radi|o* 'radio', *truub|a* 'chimney'), in which the final vowel forms a foot of its own. The nominative singular is homonymous with the genitive singular as can be also the illative singular form, but it can also have an alternative singular illative form (*karsinaaʹje, radiooʹje, truubaaʹje*) (Moshnikoff et al. 2020: 160–161). The final foot of the locative singular form is monosyllabic (*karsiin|ast, radi|ost, truub|ast*), too.

To the first inflectional class have been adapted all Russian monosyllabic nouns (76, 80, 84) (see Senkevič-Gudkova 1971: 50), as well as most of the nouns which were borrowed from the Russian vowel-ending disyllabic nouns (77–79, 81–83) (the rest of the Russian vowel-ending disyllabic nouns as well as other nouns which have preserved a word-final vowel, are adapted to the fifth inflectional class, see below). Most of these Russian loans are adapted as *â*-stem nouns (76, 77, 79), but fairly many are adapted also either as *a*-stem nouns (80, 82, 84) or *e*-stem nouns (78, 81, 83). All the Russian disyllabic nouns ending in a vowel *e* are adapted as *e*-stem nouns. The stem vowel can be seen in the locative singular form, e.g. *koossâst* scythe.SG.LOC, *kåå′fest* coffee.SG.LOC and *veelkast* fork.SG.LOC. The choice of stem vowel merits closer study in the future.

(76)    *cistt* 'honor' (KKLS 635) < честь id.

(77)    *koss* 'scythe' (KKLS 149) < косá id.

(78)    *kåå′ff* 'coffee' (KKLS 141) < кóфе id.

(79)    *liântt* 'ribbon; tape' (KKLS 210) < лéнта id.

(80)    *räkk* 'crayfish' (KKLS 419) < рак id.

(81)    *see′llj* 'gun powder' (KKLS 484) < зéлье id. (dialectal) (Plöger 1973: 177), Standard Russian 'poison'

(82)    *velkk* 'fork' (KKLS 731) < вúлка id.

(83)    *vä′šnn* 'sourdough' (KKLS 724) < квашня́ 'kneading trough'

(84)    *ätt* 'hell' (KKLS 2) < ад id.

As do the lexemes in the older lexicon, most of these nouns borrowed from Russian undergo consonant gradation. However, quite many nouns have a weak grade stem, which does not undergo consonant gradation (84–91), e.g. *steehl* 'glass' : *steehlast* SG.LOC : *steehlu* glass.SG.ILL, indicating that these words belong to a more recent Russian loanword stratum. In the grammar of Skolt Saami by Moshnikoff et al. (2020: 138) these nouns are classified as exceptions within the monosyllabic main class. They can also be classified as a subclass of their own among the first inflectional class (cf. Sammallahti & Mosnikoff 1991: 181, 182, 184, 185), as there are a relatively large number of nouns inflecting like this in Skolt Saami. Besides the Russian loan nouns, this subclass consists of a couple of yet unetymologized nouns (*kaarc* 'bad smell', *škee′rm* 'dusk' and *vääžž* 'absent-minded') as well as some recent Finnish loanwords, e.g. *duur* 'major' < *duuri* id.

(85)   *duuhh* 'smell, scent' < *дух* id.

(86)   *voozz* 'load' (~KKLS 760) < *воз* id.

(87)   *žaar* 'fever, steam in sauna, heat' (KKLS 565) < *жар* id.

(88)   *meer* 'people, village community' (KKLS 256) < *мир* 'village community (historical)'

(89)   *peehl* 'peel' (KKLS 364) < *пехло́* id.

(90)   *stuuˊl* 'chair' (KKLS 524) < *стул* id.

(91)   *zeeˊtt* 'son-in-law' (KKLS 540) < *зять* id.

Apparently, the Skolt Saami standard language favors monosyllabic first-inflectional-class nouns without consonant gradation to some extent, as the research material includes some nouns which undergo consonant gradation in the dialects but not in the standard language, e.g. *kruugg* 'circle' : *kruugg* [SG.GEN] vs. *kruƗG^A* : *krūGG^A* (S) (KKLS 873) < *круг* id. and *luukk* 'onion': *luukk* [SG.GEN] vs. *лиэ̄к̄k^A* : *лū̄эkk^A* (S) (KKLS 224) < *лук* id.

Besides the Russian monosyllabic consonant-ending and the disyllabic vowel-ending nouns, also some Russian multisyllabic lexemes have been adapted to the first inflectional class. As mentioned above, in the older lexicon, all the multisyllabic nouns which belong to the first inflectional class include some derivational suffix. That is why it is well understandable that also all the nouns which include a nominal derivational suffix *-щик/-чик* (92–94) and some of the nouns, which include a nominal derivational suffix *-ник* (95–97), have been adapted to this inflectional class. The other nouns which include a nominal derivational suffix *-ник* have been adapted to the second inflectional class. The denominal derivational suffix *-nik̆/-nek̆* has become highly productive in Skolt Saami, e.g. *k̆eˊrjjnek̆* 'writer' ← *k̆eˊrjj* 'book', *škooulnek̆* 'pupil' ← *škooul* 'school', but the suffix *-šek̆* appears only in the Russian loanwords.

(92)   *jääm|šek̆* 'coachman' (KKLS 49, 825) < *ямщи́к* id.

(93)   *tuˊrmm|šek̆* 'prisoner' < *тюре́мщик* 'jailer'

(94)   *võbor|šek̆* 'candidate, representative' (KKLS 729) < *вы́борщик* 'elector'

(95)   *prizoov|nek̆* 'conscript' < *призывни́к* id.

(96)   *prääˊz|nek̆* 'celebration' (KKLS 401) < *пра́здник* id.

(97)   *rozboi|nek̆* 'robber' (KKLS 450) < *разбо́йник* id.

There are also some nouns (e.g. 98–100) which have been adapted to the first inflectional class by using morphological adaptation instead of clear

phonetic substitution. The reason for this is clearly the phonetic similari-
ty between the second syllable of the Russian nouns and the Skolt Saami
derivational suffix *-ōs*, e.g. *čuäjtōs* 'presentation' ← *čuä′jted* 'present (v.)',
*niõggōs* 'dream (n.)' ← *niõggeed* 'dream (v.)'.

(98)    *podd|nōs* 'tray' < *поднóс* id.

(99)    *ukss|ōs* 'vinegar' (~KKLS 700) < *ýксус* id.

(100)   *ukk|ōs* 'sermon' (KKLS 700) < *укáз* 'ukase'


Yet there are some other multisyllabic Russian nouns, too (e.g. 102–105),
that were adapted to the first inflectional class and not to the second class,
but the reason for this is not clear.

(101)   *fam|iljj* 'surname' (KKLS 818) < *фамúлия* id.

(102)   *kap|us* 'cabbage' < *капýста* id.

(103)   *pooh|me′l* 'hangover' (~KKLS 390) < *похмéлье* id.

(104)   *sor|ok* 'woman's headdress; magpie' (KKLS 510) < *сорóка* id.

(105)   *zav|o′d* 'building site, logging site' (~KKLS 540) < *завóд* id.


A small number of nouns (106–109) which were originally adapted to the
second inflectional class, have been reanalyzed as nouns of the first in-
flectional class in the Skolt Saami standard language, e.g. *garmaan* 'ac-
cordion' : *garmaan* [SG.GEN] : *garmaanâst* [SG.LOC] vs. *gà̄r̄man* : *gà̄r̄man* :
*gà̄r̄mᵃ ̣nè̥st* (P) (KKLS 33) < *гармóн* id. It seems to be a tendency in the
standard language to adapt nouns into the first inflectional class, as also
many recent Finnish loan nouns are standardized as such, e.g. *artikkel* 'ar-
ticle' : *artikkee′l* [SG.GEN] : *artikkee′lest* [SG.LOC] (Moshnikoff & Moshnikoff
2020: 22) < Finnish *artikkeli* id., even if they could be adapted to the second
inflectional class, e.g. *artikkel* : *artikkel* [SG.GEN] : *artikklest* [SG.LOC].

(106)   *manah* 'monk' : *manaah* [SG.GEN] : *manaahâst* [SG.LOC] vs. *mȧnaχ* :
       *mȧnaχ* : *mȧnᵃχè̥st* (KKLS 237) < *монáх* id.

(107)   *manaster* 'monastery' : *manastee′r* [SG.GEN] : *manastee′rest* [SG.LOC]
       vs. *manaṣṭer̥* : *manaṣṭer̥* : *manaṣṭᴱ̣rè̥st* (KKLS 237) < *монасты́рь* id.

(108)   *patron* 'patron' : *patroon* [SG.GEN] : *patroonâst* [SG.LOC] vs. *patron* :
       *patron* : *pàtrᵒṇè̥st* (KKLS 346) < *патрóн* id.

(109)   *samvaar* 'samovar' : *samvaar* [SG.GEN] : *samvaarâst* [SG.LOC] vs.
       *samvar* : *samvar* : *samvr̥è̥st* (KKLS 472) < *самовáр* id.

As mentioned above, some of the one-foot nouns of Russian origin which belong to the first inflectional class, do not undergo consonant gradation. In contrast, all the two-foot nouns in this inflectional class which have been borrowed from Russian do undergo gradation in the Skolt Saami standard language, but not usually in the Skolt Saami dialects (110–112), with some exceptions, e.g. *preˀk̆t́śèˀk̆* 'hireling' (S) : *preˀk̆t́śèˀk̆k̆ᴱ* [sg.gen] (KKLS 401) < *прика́зчик* 'salesman' and *skōrлȫ̄* 'eggshell' (S) : *skōrлȍ̄* [sg.gen] (KKLS 505) < *скорлупа́* 'shell'.

(110)  *dur|ak* 'fool' : *dur|aak* [sg.gen] vs. *durak* : *durak* (Nj) (KKLS 26)  
        < *дурак* id.

(111)  *pokoi|nek̆* 'the deceased' : *pokoi|nee'k̆k̆* [sg.gen] vs. *pokoinı̣ˀk̆* :  
        *pokoinı̣ˀk̆* (P) (KKLS 391) < *поко́йник* id.

(112)  *päär|hå̆d* 'steamboat' : *päär|hå̆å̆d* [sg.gen] vs. *pàrohoᴅ* : *pàrohoᴅ* (S)  
        (KKLS 341) < *парохо́д* id.

Except for the ones mentioned above, most of the Russian disyllabic (113, 114), trisyllabic (115–117) (see Senkevič-Gudkova 1971: 50) and four-syllable (118) nouns are adapted to the second inflectional class. Also, about half of the Russian nouns which include a derivational suffix *-ник* have been adapted to this inflectional class instead of the first one. The reason behind this should be studied in the future.

(113)  *kå̆'ššel* 'purse' (KKLS 137) < *коше́ль* id.

(114)  *kå̆å̆star* 'pile' < *костёр* id.

(115)  *bo'htter* 'hero' (KKLS 24) < *богаты́рь* id.

(116)  *då̆å̆llat* 'chisel' (KKLS 26) < *долото́* id.

(117)  *me'ššer* 'brocade' < *мишура́* 'tinsel'

(118)  *skoorâd* 'frying pan' (KKLS 505) < *сковорода́* id.

(119)  *leednek̆* 'icehouse' (KKLS 203) < *ледни́к* id.

(120)  *praavnik̆* 'orthodox' < *пра́ведник* id.

(121)  *u'tree'lnik̆* 'towel' < *у́тренник* 'cloth with which newlyweds wipe  
        themselves in the morning on the second and the following days of  
        the first wedding month' (Durov 2011: 421)

Unlike the nouns in the older lexicon, most of the Russian loan nouns in the second inflectional class do not undergo consonant gradation, not

even in the standard language. There are however some exceptions to this (122–126). The only word among these which does undergo consonant gradation also in the Skolt Saami dialects is *påålas* 'sledge runner', cf. Pačč-jokk *pe̮ʟas* : *pe̮ʟ̀laz* [SG.GEN]. This exception can be explained by analogy given by older disyllabic one-foot sibilant-ending nouns, such as *kååvas* 'Saami hut' : *kåvvaz* [SG.GEN].

(122)  *pååddal* 'long line, bait' : *påddal* [SG.GEN] (KKLS 388) < *подо́льник* 'long line'

(123)  *påålas* 'sledge runner' : *pållaz* [SG.GEN] (KKLS 391) < *по́лоз* id.

(124)  *rååssal* 'seawater' : *råssal* [SG.GEN] (KKLS 451) < *рассо́л* 'brine'

(125)  *strooiʹtel* 'institution; plant' : *stroiʹttel* [SG.GEN] < *стройтельство* 'construction project'

(126)  *sååbbar* 'meeting' : *såbbar* [SG.GEN] (KKLS 511) < *собо́р* id.

There are a small number of Russian loan nouns which belong to the second inflectional class, end in a consonant cluster, and in which largo–allegro alternation takes place in the stressed syllable (127–130). In these words, the first foot is largo in two-foot word forms, such as in the locative singular form, e.g. *star|stest*, or in the illative singular form, e.g. *star|sta*.

(127)  *kreäppast* 'mortgage deed, fortress' : *kreäp|stest* [SG.LOC] (KKLS 155) < *кре́пость* id.

(128)  *räädast* 'joy' : *räd|stest* [SG.LOC] < *ра́дость* id.

(129)  *staarâst* 'village elder' : *star|stest* [SG.LOC] (KKLS 521) < *ста́роста* id.

(130)  *voolâst* 'volost (a historical administrative region)' : *vol|stest* [SG.LOC] (KKLS 760) < *во́лость* id.

The Russian vowel-ending disyllabic (132, 133), trisyllabic (134, 135) or four-syllable (136) nouns, in which apocope has not taken place, have been adapted to the fifth inflectional class. The fact that apocope has not taken place indicates that these words belong to the recent Russian loanword stratum. The fifth inflectional class has developed in Skolt Saami along with Russian loanwords. In addition to Russian loans, a large number of nouns borrowed from Finnish have been adapted to this inflectional class, e.g. *historia* 'history' < Finnish *historia* id. and *teknologia* 'technology' < Finnish *teknologia* id.

(131)   *kruuška* 'mug' < *крýжка* id.

(132)   *peela* 'two-man cross-cut saw' (KKLS 352) < *пилá* 'saw'

(133)   *vääda* 'wadding' (~KKLS 725) < *вáта* id.

(134)   *mo'lidva* 'prayer' (~KKLS 235) < *молúтва* id.

(135)   *lampatka* 'altar lamp' (~KKLS 192) < *лампáдка* id.

(136)   *panahida* 'requiem' < *панихúда* id.

## 4.2. Verbs

In Skolt Saami verbs can be classified according to the finite forms. One inflectional class is formed by verbs in which the final foot of the infinite form is disyllabic, e.g. *poorrâd* 'eat', *vue'lǧǧed* 'leave', *åskkad* 'believe', *kagg|õõttâd* 'stand up, rise', another class by verbs in which the final foot is a monosyllabic largo, e.g. *haa'l|eed* 'want', and a third class by verbs in which the final foot is a monosyllabic allegro, e.g. *fi'tt|jed* 'understand'. The first inflectional class is further divided into three subclasses according to infinitive suffix: *-âd*, *-ed* and *-ad*. (For details, see Koponen et al. 2022: 208–210.)

Although the majority of the Skolt Saami verbs do not contain any phonological features revealing the loan source, for some verbs it can be shown that the loan source was not an infinite form but a finite stem. For the verbs (137–140), this can be concluded from the Russian word-initial consonant alternations. For example, *priimmâd* 'accept' was clearly borrowed from a stem *прúм-* (e.g. *примý* FUT.1SG, *прúмет* FUT.3SG, *примú* IMP.SG) in which there is a word-initial nasal [ḿ], and not [ń], as in the infinite form *принять* 'accept'. A similar tendency is found also in other languages, too, such as in Estonian and Finnish (see also Wohlgemuth 2009: 79), although in most studies it is thought that the loan source was the present-tense third-person form and not the finite stem. According to Must (2000: 541), the loan source of the Estonian verb *kladima* 'put' was the Russian third-person present form *кладёт* and not the infinite form *класть* 'put', which is revealed by the consonant alternation in Russian, but according to Blokland (2009: 358) the loan source could have been some other finite form, too, e.g. *кладý* PRS.1SG. In other cases, such as in the Finnish verb *maania* 'coax', the loan source is revealed by a long vowel in the first syllable, which is explained by the word stress on the first syllable in the third-person singular present form *мáнит*, unlike in the infinite

form *манúть* 'beckon, attract', in which the word stress is on the second syllable (Plöger 1973: 297). As in Skolt Saami, in both these cases and also more generally, one can analyze them as reflecting the finite stem as the loan source rather than some certain finite form.

(137)  *prooidâd* 'fall, pass' < *пройтú* id. : *пройд-*
(138)  *každōōttâd* 'appear' (KKLS 96) < *казáться* id. : *кáж-*
(139)  *toᵈp̄tsɒᴅ* 'trample' (KKLS 607) < *monmámь* id. : *móнч-*
(140)  *priimmâd* 'accept' < *принять* id. : *прúм-*

There is also at least one case in which the loan source was undoubtedly the infinite form. *Pleässjed* 'dance' (KKLS 381) was not borrowed from the Russian finite stem *пляш-* (e.g. *пляшет* ᴘʀꜱ.3ꜱɢ, *пляши* ɪᴍᴘ.ꜱɢ) but the infinitive form *плясать* 'dance', as revealed by the sibilant alternation in Russian. The Finnic languages, too, have borrowed at least some verbs from Russian infinite forms. According to Plöger (1973: 297), while in most cases it cannot be shown from which form Russian loan verbs were borrowed into Finnish, there are some verbs for which the loan source was clearly the infinite form. Interestingly, according to Must (2000: 541) and Blokland (2009: 297), the infinite form was the loan source for most of the Russian loan verbs in Estonian.

Wohlgemuth (2009) has created a verbal borrowing classification. His classification consists of four main strategies: direct insertion, indirect insertion, the light verb strategy and paradigm insertion. The direct and indirect insertions are cases where a borrowed verbal stem is combined with morphology of the target language. In direct insertion the inflectional suffixes attach directly to the borrowed verb stem, while in indirect insertion, a derivational suffix is added before the inflectional suffixes. Skolt Saami uses both of these strategies in the adaption of Russian loan verbs. However, Skolt Saami does not use the light verb strategy nor paradigm insertion strategy. The light verb strategy means that an uninflected loan verb is accompanied by an inflected verb of the target language. In these constructions, the most common light verb is 'do', which is used in Udmurt to adapt Russian nouns (Arkhangelskiy 2019: 527). The paradigm insertion strategy involves cases, the morphology of the source language is used to inflect the loan verb without the target language's own inflectional morphology. However, it is often difficult to distinguish these cases from word-level codeswitching.

In most cases, Skolt Saami uses the direct insertion strategy to adapt Russian loan verbs. The verbs are adapted without any derivational suffix into the inflectional class in which the final foot of the infinite form is disyllabic and ends in *-âd* (141–143). Most of these verbs undergo consonant gradation and there is a long vowel in the first syllable in the infinitive form. In the Skolt Saami standard language, the only *â*-stem verb that has a short vowel in the first syllable in the infinite form is *fattâd* 'be enough' < *хватúть* id.

(141)   *kaađđâd* 'burn incense' : *kaađam* [1SG.PRS] < *кадúть* id.
(142)   *liâššâd* 'lie' : *liâžžam* [1SG.PRS] (KKLS 212) < *лежáть* id.
(143)   *sniimmâd* 'photograph' : *sniimam* [1SG.PRS] < *снимáть* id.

However, a small number of verbs ending in *-âd* in the infinite form (144–149) do not undergo consonant gradation, e.g. *čiistâd* 'clean' : *čiistam* [PRS.1SG] : *čeeʹste* [PRS.3PL] (KKLS 668) < *чúстить* id., which suggests that these are recent loanwords.

(144)   *kruužâd* 'cut hide along its edge' (KKLS 156) < *кружúть* 'spin around'
(145)   *praavâd* 'check' < *прáвить* 'correct'
(146)   *priiskâd* 'sprinkle' < *брызгать* id.
(147)   *sluužâd* 'serve' (~KKLS 506) < *служúть* id.
(148)   *tuužžâd* 'grieve' < *тужúть* id.
(149)   *voozzâd* 'transport' (Eliseev & Zajceva 2007: 127; ~KKLS 76) < *возúть* id.

The loss of consonant gradation in the Russian loan verbs ending in *-âd* seems to be some kind of tendency, since there are a small number of such verbs that undergo consonant gradation in the Skolt Saami dialects but not in the standard language (150, 151). Interestingly, this change does not concern any other verbs besides Russian loan verbs. As we have seen in Section 4.1, also the Russian loan nouns in the first inflectional class display a similar tendency.

(150)   *dooidâd* ~ *doīp̄ᴠᴅ* (P) 'arrive' (KKLS 26) < *доймú* 'reach'
(151)   *uuidâd* ~ *uị̄p̄ᴠᴅ* (P) 'get away, leave' (KKLS 699) < *уймú* id.

There are also a small number of two-foot verbs in the research material which were adapted to Skolt Saami without any derivational suffix, and in which the infinitive form ends in either *-Ced* (other than *-jed*) (152–154) or *-eed* (155–156). The former verbs were borrowed from Russian three-syllable verbs and the latter verbs from Russian four-syllable verbs.

(152)  *näärved* 'keep an eye on; wait' (KKLS 274) < *наровúть* 'aim (dialectal)' (Vasmer 227), Standard Russian *норовúть* id.

(153)  *kołłᵊᵊ̣ttɐ* (P) 'knock; knock off' (~KKLS 144) < *колотúть* 'beat'

(154)  *uhåå'ded* 'waste' (KKLS 698) < *уходúть* 'wear out'

(155)  *pråppeed* 'perish (of reindeer or other animals in the forest)' (KKLS 402) < *пропадáть* 'be missing'

(156)  *poppeed* 'get caught' (KKLS 395) < *попадáть* 'get caught (imperfective)'

There are also a handful of verbs in Skolt Saami ending in *-jed* in the infinitive form, which were borrowed from Russian. Fairly many of these verbs were borrowed from Russian first-conjugation verbs of which the third-person singular present tense form ends in either *-aem* [ajet] or *-eem* [ejet] (157–160), and in one case also *-aemcя* [ajets'a] (161). It seems that these verbs were adapted into the inflectional class in which the infinite form ends in *-jed*, because the Russian third-person singular present tense form ends in *-jet*. However, this does not explain all the verbs adapted into this inflectional class, since this inflectional class consists also of some verbs which lack present-tense forms in Russian (162–163). Also, some Russian second-conjugation verbs, the third-person singular present tense form of which ends in *-aem*, have been adapted in the inflectional class of verbs ending in *-âd* (164–165).

(157)  *mää'rjed* 'stain; dirty' (KKLS 241) < *марáть* id. : *марáем* [PRS.3SG]

(158)  *šää'l'jed* 'go crazy' (~KKLS 542) < *шалéть* id. : *шалéем* [PRS.3SG]

(159)  *ža'll'jed* 'feel sorry' (KKLS 543) < *жалéть* id. : *жалеем* [PRS.3SG]

(160)  *vää'l'jed* 'knead dough' (KKLS 715) < *валять* id. : *валяем* [PRS.3SG]

(161)  *snasmie'hhjed* 'mock' < *насмехáться* id. : *насмехáется* [PRS.3SG]

(162)  *pro'sttjed*[1] 'forgive' (KKLS 402) < *простúть* id.

---

1.  The complement is in the accusative, e.g. *pro'sttje muu!* 'forgive me!' as in Russian *простú меня!* id.

(163)  *vo'sttjed* 'admire' < *восхи́ть* id.

(164)  *priiskâd* 'sprinkle' < *бры́згать* id. : *брызгает* [PRS.3SG]

(165)  *sniimmâd* 'photograph' < *снима́ть* id. : *снимает* [PRS.3SG]

In the case of borrowed Russian reflexive verbs, Skolt Saami uses the indirect insertion strategy. The Russian reflexive verbs have been integrated into Skolt Saami by adding the deverbal affix *-j-* or *-d-* and the reflexive verb suffix *-õõttâd* to the loan stem (166–170). The only exception in the research material is *snasmie'hhjed* 'mock' < *насмеха́ться* id., which has been adapted to the inflectional class in which the infinitive form ends in *-jed*.

(166)  *prå'ššjõõttâd* 'say goodbye' (KKLS 402) < *проща́ться* id.

(167)  *rä'ddjõõttâd* 'be glad' (KKLS 415) < *ра́доваться* id.

(168)  *na'ddjõõttâd* 'hope; rely' (KKLS 269) < *наде́яться* id.

(169)  *každõõttâd* 'appear' (KKLS 96) < *каза́ться* id.

(170)  *spraavdõõttâd* 'manage, make' (~KKLS 519) < *спра́виться* 'manage'

## 4.3. Adjectives

In Skolt Saami, when an adjective functions as the head of a noun phrase, the adjective takes case and number marking in the same way as nouns, e.g. *põrtt lij oođâs* 'the house is new', *põõrt lie ođđâz* 'the houses are new', *saattčõ'ttem vuä'mm põõrtâst ođđsa* 'I moved from the old house to a new house'. If an adjective modifies a noun, a special attributive form is used which does not inflect like the predicative form, e.g. *tõt lij ođđ põrtt* 'that is a new house', *tõk lie ođđ põõrt* 'those are new houses', *saattčõ'ttem ođđ põ'rtte* 'I moved to a new house'. However, not every adjective has an attributive form. In this case the nominative singular form is used when an adjective modifies a noun.

The research material contains almost one hundred words that were borrowed from Russian adjectives. Most of these words act as adjectives (171–173).

(171)  *poostai* 'desolate' < *пусто́й* 'empty'

(172)  *pudovai* 'one pood in weight' < *пудо́вый* id.

(173)  *teâmnai* 'dark' < *тёмный* id.

There are also a small number of words which, though they were borrowed from Russian adjectives, act as nouns in Skolt Saami. Only a few of these seem to be developed as nouns only in Skolt Saami (174–176). Some of the words appeared as nouns already in Russian (177–178) (cf. Ojanen 1985: 125–126; Must 2000: 534, 537–539). Most of these words, however, were borrowed from Russian noun phrases with an adjective modifier (179–181) (cf. Pyöli 1996: 236). There are also a few compound words in the research material, the first part of which is a direct loan from a Russian adjective modifier and the latter part is a loan translation of the Russian noun (183–184) (cf. Ojanen 1985: 181–183). However, the compound word *roodnai(ruått)* 'close relative' (*ruått* 'relative') < *родной* 'related by blood' has no parallel in Russian but has developed within Skolt Saami.

(174)   *žeevai* 'animal' (KKLS 565) < *живóй* 'lively'

(175)   *dostoini* 'Prayer to Mary, Mother of God' < *достóйный* 'worthy'

(176)   *lie′tni* 'southwest, southwest wind' (KKLS 212) < *летний* 'id. (dialectal)' (Durov 2011: 207), Standard Russian 'summer (adj.)'

(177)   *nje′veârna* 'infidel' < *невéрный* id. (archaic)

(178)   *di′seâckai* 'civil servant in village (hist.)' (KKLS 815) < *десятский* id.

(179)   *na′zvan* 'friend' < *назвáный брат* 'sworn brother' (*брат* 'brother')

(180)   *leâsnai* 'forest ranger' < *леснóй стóрож* id. (*стóрож* 'guard')

(181)   *dovee′rnai* 'person empowered to act for sb' (KKLS 816) < *довéренное лицó* id. (*лицó* 'person')

(182)   *nozvai(ree′ppiǩ)* 'handkerchief; tissue' (*ree′ppiǩ* 'scarf') < *носовóй (платóк)* 'handkerchief' (*платóк* 'scarf')

(183)   *sklädd(nei′bb)* 'pocketknife' (KKLS 504) (*nei′bb* 'knife') < *складнóй нож* id. (*нож* 'knife')

(184)   *troicǩi(pei′vv)* 'Pentecost' (KKLS 611) < *трóицкий* 'Trinity (adj.)', cf. *трóицын день* 'Pentecost'

Unlike Russian, Skolt Saami has no grammatical gender. All the adjectives were borrowed from the Russian masculine forms (see below), which is also typical for other Uralic languages in contact with Russian, such as Komi (Kalima 1911: 32) and Ludian (Ojanen 1985: 152). As a matter of fact, the use of masculine forms is so dominant that they are used also in compound words that are borrowed from Russian feminine adjective phrases, e.g. *strääšnai(neä′ttel)* 'Holy Week' (KKLS 523) < *страстнáя недéля* id., or

neuter adjective phrases, such as *ro·ᴅimnɑi-pietnᵉ* 'birthmark' (KKLS 447) < *родúмное пятнó* id. (cf. Ojanen 1985: 152).

The Russian adjectives can be divided into long and short forms. In addition to gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) and number, long forms can be inflected in cases, unlike short forms. Long masculine forms have an adjective suffix *-ой*, *-ый* or *-ий*, but in Northern dialects of Russian it is often *-ой* even if the stress is on a syllable other than the last, e.g. *стáрой* 'old', *хорóшой* 'good', cf. Standard Russian *стáрый*, *хорóший* (Post 2005: 61; Ojanen 1985: 153–155 and sources cited therein).

In Skolt Saami, adjectives borrowed from Russian long masculine forms end in *-oi*, *-ai* or *-i* (a–c).

a)  The Russian stressed suffix *-óй* appears in Skolt Saami as either *-oi* (185–186) or *-ai* (187–188).

(185)  *holostoi(pä'rnn)* 'bachelor' (KKLS 41) (*pä'rnn* 'boy') < *холостóй* 'unmarried (man)'

(186)  *sta·novoi-* 'support-' (KKLS 520) < *становóй* id.

(187)  *gluuhhai* 'deaf' < *глухóй* 'deaf'

(188)  *poostai* 'desolate' < *пустóй* 'empty'


b)  The Russian unstressed *-ый* appears in Skolt Saami as either *ai* (189–190) or *-i* (191–192).

(189)  *ceâlai* 'whole' < *цéлый* id.

(190)  *totšnai*² 'permanent' < *тóчный* 'exact'

(191)  *ma'linovi* (*ruõpssâd*) 'orange (adj.)' (*ruõpssâd* 'red') < *малúновый* 'crimson'

(192)  *lie'tni* 'southwest' (KKLS 212) < *лéтний* 'id. (dialectal)' (Durov 2011: 207), Standard Russian 'summer'

---

2.  Unlike in Russian, in this word there is no affricate but a combination of a stop and a sibilant (Facebook, Koltankieliset group 1.10.2020, https://www.facebook.com/groups/185297610101/search/?q=totšnai).

c) Russian unstressed *-ий* appears in Skolt Saami as *-ai* (193) or *-i* (194–195).

(193)   *reâtkai* 'sparse' (KKLS 439) < *рéдкий* id.
(194)   *nastojâšši* 'real, ordinal' (KKLS 275) < *настоящий* 'real'
(195)   *troicǩi(-pei'vv)* 'Pentecost' (KKLS 611) < *трóицкий* 'Trinity (adj.)', cf. *трóицын день* 'Pentecost'

In a few rare cases, the Russian adjective suffix has been left unsubstituted. There are examples of this both among the words acting as adjectives (196–198) and among the compound words (199–201). Some of the adjectives, at least *vååstar* 'brave, sharp-witted' (KKLS 760) < *вóстрый* 'sharp-witted (dialectal)' (Durov 2011: 67) and *šää'lan* 'troublemaker, crazy' (KKLS 544) < *шальнóй* 'crazy', have been adapted into the class of two-syllable consonant-ending adjectives so that the vowel of the second syllable divides the consonant cluster (see the corresponding adaption of nouns in 4.2).

(196)   *na'zvan* 'friend' < *назвáный брат* 'sworn brother' (*брат* 'brother')
(197)   *rĭĕťk̀ᴬ* 'sparse' (P) (KKLS 439) < *рéдкий* id.
(198)   *spokoi* 'calm' < *спокóйный* id., cf. Karelian *spokoi* 'free'
(199)   *sklädd(nei'bb)* 'pocketknife' (KKLS 504) (*nei'bb* 'knife') < *складнóй нож* id. (*нож* 'knife')
(200)   *straš(-nĕ̆ằɔ̧ṭṭeḷ)* (S) 'Holy Week' (KKLS 523) < *страстнáя недéля* id.
(201)   *tròits(-pei̧v̄)* (S) 'Pentecost' (KKLS 611) (*pei'vv* 'day') < *трóицын день* id. (*день* 'day')

In addition to the adjectives borrowed from Russian long-form adjectives, Skolt Saami adjectives have also been borrowed from the short masculine forms (202–204). These adjectives form about a quarter of all adjectives borrowed from Russian.

(202)   *oddâl* 'brave, energetic' (KKLS 312) < *удáл* 'brave (short masculine)'
(203)   *råå'van* 'straight' (KKLS 453) < *рóвен* 'straight (short masculine)'
(204)   *vie'ssel* 'glad' (KKLS 729) < *вéсел* 'glad (short masculine)'

Apparently, the choice of long and short forms as the loan source is not random, since usually the same adjective is borrowed from the same form for all Skolt Saami dialects (205–206). However, it is worth noting that

there is at least one adjective which exists in variants borrowed from different Russian adjective forms (207).

(205) *prååstai*, *prȯ̀stǫi* (S), *prō̜stǫi* (Nj) 'simple' (KKLS 402) < *простóй* id.

(206) *lääskav*, *лāskʊn* (Nj) 'gentle' (KKLS 195) < *лáсков* 'gentle (short masculine)'

(207) *reâdak* 'sparse' (KKLS 436) < *рéдок* 'sparse (short masculine)', *reâtkai* 'sparse' (KKLS 439) < *рéдкий* id.

Adjectives borrowed from both Russian long and short forms are also found in the Finnic languages. Usually, the Finnic adjectives correspond to the forms of Skolt Saami (208–212). According to Ojanen (1985: 176–178), the Ludian adjectives borrowed from the short forms of Russian adjectives are older than those borrowed from the long forms. She argues this on the basis of the following: the adaptation of the adjectives to the morphology of Ludian, their domains of use, and the fact that Russian short forms have become rarer over the centuries, even though they were common in the past. Since the contacts between Skolt Saami and Russian are considerably newer than contacts between Ludian and Russian, it is not clear whether the adjectives borrowed from the short forms also in Skolt Saami belong to an older loanword stratum than the adjectives borrowed from the long forms. This should be studied in the future.

(208) *bohat* 'rich' (KKLS 24) ~ Kar. *pohatta* id. < *богám* 'rich (short masc.)'

(209) *vie′ssel* 'glad' (KKLS 729) ~ Kar. *vesselä* id. < *вéсел* 'glad (short masc.)'

(210) *neâmmai* 'dumb' ~ Kar. *ńemoi* id. < *немóй* id.

(211) *veârnai* 'honest' ~ Kar. *viernoi* id. < *вéрный* id.

(212) *vääžnai* 'important' ~ Kar. *voašnoi* id. < *вáжный* id.

Both adjectives borrowed from the Russian short forms, as well as those adjectives borrowed from the long forms in which the Russian adjective suffix has been left unsubstituted, belong to the inflectional class of disyllabic consonant-ending adjectives that do not undergo consonant gradation (see Feist 2015: 174–175). In addition to the Russian loanwords, this inflectional class consists of some derived adjectives such as *loolâč* 'jealous' < *loollâd* 'be jealous'. Like many other Skolt Saami adjectives, the adjectives belonging to this inflectional class often have, in addition to the predicative form, an attributive form. The attributive form is formed

with the suffix *-ōs* and before it the unstressed vowel undergoes syncope, e.g. *толко́в* 'reasonable (short masculine)' > *toolkav* 'reasonable' : *toolkvōs* [ATTR], cf. *jå'ttel* 'fast' : *jå'ttlōs* [ATTR].

Adjectives borrowed from the Russian long forms do not form one homogeneous class of adjectives. Many of these adjectives are disyllabic, they do not undergo consonant gradation and their stem is always in the weak grade (213–215).

(213)   *prååstai* 'simple, ordinary' (KKLS 402) < *просто́й* id.

(214)   *seenai* 'blue' (KKLS 485) < *си́ный* id.

(215)   *vääžnai* 'important' < *ва́жный* id.

These adjectives resemble the Skolt Saami *i*-ending adjectives derived from nouns, e.g. *čáccai* 'watery' ← *čáá'cc* 'water', *sälttai* 'salty' ← *sä'ltt* 'salt', *piõ'ǧǧi* 'windy' ← *piõgg* 'wind' (see Feist 2015: 128–129). However, the stem of these derived adjectives is in the overlong grade. Also, unlike the adjectives derived from nouns, the attributive form of which is created regularly from the predicative form, e.g. *čáccai* 'watery' : *čáccas* 'watery (ATTR)', *sälttai* 'salty' : *sälttas* 'salty (ATTR)', only a few Russian loans have a separate attributive form. In fact, according to the KKLS, the Russian loan adjectives of this type do not have any attributive form at all. In contrast, the dictionary by Sammallahti and Moshnikoff (1991) as well as the dictionary by Moshnikoff and Moshnikoff (2020) also give attributive forms in connection with a few adjectives of this type, e.g. *snäätnai* 'faithful' : *snäätnas* 'faithful (ATTR)' < *зна́тный* 'noble; outstanding'. Apparently, the attributive forms of these adjectives are formed according to the analogy given by *i*-ending adjectives derived from nouns.

There are also a few trisyllabic and four-syllable adjectives in the research material (216–218). These must be recent loans, as they have not been properly phonologically adapted to the Skolt Saami vocabulary. This can be concluded by the fact that in these words, the vowel of the second syllable has not syncopated and all the vowels are short, which was not possible in the older lexicon.

(216)   *godovai* 'annual' < *годово́й* id.

(217)   *ma'linovi* (*ruõpssâd*) 'orange (adj.)' (*ruõpssâd* 'red') < *мали́новый* 'crimson'

(218)   *o'dinakai* 'only' < *одино́кий* 'lonely'

## 5. Semantics of the Russian loanwords

In this section, I will study the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami from a semantic perspective. Since for this paper it does not make sense to present all the semantic fields, I analyze only the most common ones (religion, clothing, buildings and houses, diet, as well as administration and society), which reveal the most important contact situations between the Skolt Saami and the Russians. I also represent a couple of semantic fields (military, agriculture and nature) which contain only a few Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami, even though in Estonian and Finnish there are much more. The differences in the loanwords in these semantic fields reveal differences between the contacts of the Skolt Saami and the Russians and the contacts between the Estonians or Finns and the Russians. A more accurate description of the semantics of the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami is left for other studies in the future. For this purpose, one could use, for example, the classifications developed by Plöger (1973: 307–308), Must (2000: 557–575) or Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 22–34).

As mentioned in Section 2.1, Starowicz (1983: 43–48) studied the semantics of Russian loanwords in Skolt, Kildin and Ter Saami. He divides Russian loanwords into four major fields, which are further divided into several subfields: 1) everyday life (customs, work and tools, society, dressing, construction, the household, food, family, weather, body parts and diseases, human settlement, colors, emotions), 2) livelihoods (agriculture, animal husbandry, animals, trade, traveling, fishing), 3) religion and belief and 4) other words (miscellaneous words, military service, pastime and toys, science). It is worth noting that sometimes his semantic division is incorrect. For example, under animals as a subgroup of livelihoods, there are words such as *kloopp* 'bedbug' (KKLS 131) < *клоп* id. and *leeff* 'lion' (KKLS 212) < *лев* id., which cannot be considered to belong to livelihoods.

The influence of the Orthodox Church on the life of the Skolt Saami is strong (see e.g. Itkonen 1948: I, 85–87, 295; II, 355–357, 413–422, 424, 518–519, 589), which is why Skolt Saami has borrowed a lot of religious vocabulary from Russian. There is also a lot of religious vocabulary of Russian origin in Kildin Saami, too (Rießler 2009a: 402), as well as in the eastern dialects of Estonian (Must 2000: 571–572), while such vocabulary is fewer in the more western dialects of Estonian and in Finnish (Plöger 1973: 307), which can be explained by the influence of the Orthodox Church in the eastern parts of Estonia and Finland.

- religious vocabulary: *Bååžž* 'God (children's language)' < *Бóже* 'God', *praavniǩ* 'orthodox' < *прáведник* 'righteous man', *pričas'* '(Holy) Communion' < *причáстие* id., *priiskâd* 'sprinkle (e.g. holy water)' < *бры́згать* 'sprinkle', *prosttvõrr* 'the Host' < *просфорá* id., *Spa'site'l* 'the Saviour' < *Спаси́тель* id. (59 words)

Unlike more western Saami groups, the Skolt Saami calendar has traditionally been based largely on Orthodox holidays (Itkonen 1948: II, 487–489).

- religious holidays: *panahida* 'requiem' < *панихи́да* id., *raa'dnec(-pei'vv)* 'commemoration of the deceased' (KKLS 415) (*pei'vv* 'day') < *Рáдуница* id., *veežnai(pei'vv)* 'Exaltation of the Cross' < *Воздви́жение* id., *vo'zzen'ja(-pei'vv)* 'Ascension Day' < *вознесéние* id. (8 words)

A lot of clothing-related vocabulary has been borrowed into Skolt Saami from Russian. This is evidenced by the change of clothing to the Russian model, for example, at the end of the 19th century the Skolt Saami men switched to wearing the Russian-style jacket *kähttan* 'jacket' (KKLS 80) < *кафтáн* 'kaftan' (Itkonen 1948: I, 348, 356).

- pieces of clothing: *faardiǩ* 'apron' (KKLS 32) < *фáртук* id., *knoopkaž* 'snap' < *кнóпка* id., *käätnaǩ* 'felt boot' < *кáтанок* id., *poteâška* 'suspender' (KKLS 399) < *подтя́жка* id., *saarfan* 'traditional gown' (~KKLS 474) < *сарафáн* id., *trååika* 'three-piece suit' < *трóйка* id. (24 words)

Skolt Saami women began wearing Russian-style headwear as early as the beginning of the 18th century (Itkonen 1948: I, 368–369). Along with the new headwear, the Skolt Saami borrowed also the words for these items.

- headdress: *koolpiǩ* 'woolly hat' (KKLS 145) < *колпáк* 'cap', *pee'rvesǩ* 'unmarried Skolt Saami girl's headdress' (KKLS 357) < *перевя́зка* 'bandage', *poo'vdneǩ* 'Skolt Saami widow's headdress' (KKLS 401) < *повóйник* 'married woman's headdress', *sorok* 'woman's headdress' (KKLS 510) < *сорóка* id., *šaamšiǩ ~ šămšăr* (P) 'married Skolt Saami woman's headdress' (KKLS 544) < *шамшýра* 'married woman's headdress', *šleäpp* 'brimmed hat' (KKLS 557) < *шля́па* 'hat', *triiviǩ* 'Skolt Saami woman's winter cap' (KKLS 610) < *треýх* 'winter cap' (8 words)

Although only a few words for buildings have been borrowed from Russian into Skolt Saami, it can be concluded that the Skolt Saami have learned a lot about construction technology from the Russians, since there are a

number of construction-technology vocabulary items of Russian origin in
Skolt Saami. The Skolt Saami also learned the use of some new building
materials and tools from the Russians. In addition, such words as *domm*
'home' (KKLS 26, 816) < *дом* id. and the adverbs *domoi* 'home (motion)'
(~KKLS 816) < *домо́й* id. and *dååma* 'at home' (~KKLS 816) < *до́ма* id. were
borrowed from Russian.

- buildings: *leedneǩ* 'icehouse' (KKLS 203) < *ледни́к* id., *mostt* 'bridge'
  (KKLS 261) < *мост* id., *nuu'žniǩ* 'toilet' (KKLS 291) < *ну́жник* id. (ar-
  chaic), *poo'grev* 'cellar' (KKLS 390) < *по́греб* id. (5 words)
- building materials and parts of a building: *mää'tec* 'ridge beam'
  (KKLS 242) < *ма́тица* id., *poodval* 'bottom timber of a house'
  (KKLS 389) < *подва́л* 'basement', *žåålab* 'gutter' (KKLS 565) < *жёлоб* id.
  (18 words)
- construction technology: *buuråfǩ* 'gimlet' (KKLS 25) < *бура́вка* 'drill',
  *preu'nn* 'log' (KKLS 25) < *бревно́* id., *fintt* 'screw' (KKLS 32) < *винт* id.,
  *žee'st* 'metal plate' (KKLS 565) < *жесть* id. (12 words)

Only a few names of dishes in Skolt Saami have been borrowed from Rus-
sian. Names of sweets and pastries have also been only sparsely borrowed.

- names of dishes: *kuu'rniǩ* 'fish baked inside a loaf of bread' (KKLS 181)
  < *ку́рник* 'pie stuffed with chicken or fish', *mie'lǩǩsållmat* 'cheese soup
  with berries' (*mie'lǩǩ* 'milk') ~ *sọˑłºmạˀī* (P) 'flour porridge' (KKLS 514)
  < *салама́та* 'flour porridge' (3 words)
- names of sweets and pastries: *bliin* 'pancake' (KKLS 24) < *блин* id.,
  *kâ'nfeât* 'sweet' < *конфе́та* id., *pre'nneǩ* 'gingerbread' (KKLS 401)
  < *пря́ник* id., *soohar* 'rusk' (KKLS 512) < *суха́рь* id., *šä'ŋǧǧ* 'sweet pasty'
  (KKLS 544) < *шаньга* id. (Myznikov 2010: 477) (5 words)

Starowicz (1983: 45) suggests in his semantic division that, for example, the
words *kååraǩ* 'pea' (KKLS 34) < *горо́х* id., *ååvaš* 'vegetable' (~KKLS 326)
< *о́вощи* 'vegetables' and *åå'ves* 'oat' (KKLS 326) < *овёс* id. are related to
agriculture. However, in Skolt Saami such words do not relate to agricul-
ture, as the Skolt Saami did not practice agriculture, but rather these words
are related to purchased foodstuffs. Other names of foodstuffs borrowed
from Russian are listed below.

- foodstuffs: *gruuža* 'pear' < *гру́ша* id., *kapus* 'cabbage' < *капу́ста* id.,
  *maa'liu(mue'rjj)* 'raspberry' (*mue'rjj* 'berry') < *мали́на* id., *prååss* 'millet'

(KKLS 402) < *пр́осо* id., *päättaǩ* 'syrup' (KKLS 346) < *н́атока* id., *roošš* 'rye' (KKLS 451) < *рожь* id., *ukssõs* 'vinegar' (~KKLS 700) < *́уксус* id., *åå′reh* 'nut' (KKLS 320) < *ор́ех* 'nut' (20 words)

Also other words related to cooking and eating have been borrowed from Russian.

- cooking and eating: *pävvar* 'cook' (KKLS 347) < *п́овар* id., *säähharne′cc* 'sugar basin' < *с́ахарница* id., *velkk* 'fork' (~KKLS 753) < *в́илка* id., *vää′l′ jed* 'knead dough' (KKLS 715) < *вал́ять* id. (19 words)

Tea, known as *čee* (KKLS 655) < *чай* id., has been an important part of Skolt Saami culture since the 20th century. Almost every family had a samovar, a *samvaar* (KKLS 472) < *самов́ар* id., of their own, in addition to which tea was made in a tea kettle, *čei′nniǩ* (KKLS 655) < *ч́айник* id. Coffee *kåå′ff* (KKLS 141) < *ќофе* id., on the other hand was an unknown drink still in the 19th century, but it was drunk by the early 20th century (Itkonen 1948: I, 296).

Also, alcohol was widely used by the Skolt Saami, especially during festivities and in winter villages in general. Liquor was bought both from the town of Kola and from Russian vendors (Itkonen 1948: I, 86, 297–298; II, 413–422). During a trip to Kola, alcohol could have also been consumed at a tavern, *kāvve′ǩ* (KKLS 76) < *каб́ак* id.

- alcohol: *hloopnâd* 'take a sip' < *хл́опнуть* id. cf. *хл́опнуть п́ива* 'drink a beer in one sip', *poohme′l* 'hangover' (~KKLS 390) < *похм́елье* id., *spiirt* 'spirit' (KKLS 519) < *спирт* id., *šää′lan* 'drunken troublemaker, crazy' (KKLS 544) < *шальн́ой* 'crazy' and *tiõrv′vuõttân* [health.ESS] 'cheers' and *tiõrvvsa* [healthy.SG.ILL] 'cheers' which both are loan translations from *на здор́овье* id. (10 words)

Before World War I the Skolt Saami did not smoke for religious reasons (Itkonen 1948: I, 295–296), which is why only the words *kuurâd* 'smoke (v.)' (KKLS 181) < *кур́ить* id. and *tääbbaǩ* 'tobacco' (KKLS 566) < *таб́ак* id. have been borrowed from Russian.

The Russian administration and society had a great influence on the lives of the Skolt Saami, which is why related words have also been borrowed from Russian into Skolt Saami. There are also some words of Russian origin in Skolt Saami related to the maintenance of law and order. (Itkonen 1948: II, 253–256, 589)

- administration and society: *meer* 'village community' (KKLS 256) < *мир* id., *o'bjee'ččiǩ* 'bailiff' < *объéздчик* 'forest ranger', *pječat* 'seal, stamp' (KKLS 361) < *печáть* id., *voolâst* 'volost (historical administrative region)' (KKLS 760) < *вóлость* id., *åå'ral* 'stamp' < *орёл* 'eagle', cf. the double-headed eagle on Russia's coat of arms, which used to be also on stamps (16 words)
- law and order: *pleân* 'prisoner' < *плéнник* id., *på'reâd* 'order' < *порядок* id., *suud* 'court' (KKLS 525) < *суд* id., *štraaf* 'fine' (KKLS 561) < *штраф* id. (8 words)

By contrast, there are only a few items of Russian loan vocabulary in Skolt Saami related to the army: *prizoov* 'conscription' < *призы́в* 'military call-up', *prizoovneǩ* 'conscript' < *призывни́к* id., *stiik* 'bayonet' < *штык* id. and *sääldat* 'soldier' (KKLS 469) < *солдáт* id. This is understandable, since the Skolt Saami were not recruited into the army before the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) and World War I. In comparison, for example in Estonian (Must 2000: 570–571) and Finnish (Plöger 1973: 308) there is considerably more vocabulary of Russian origin related to the army, which is understandable, as Estonians and Finns were recruited into the Russian army well before the Skolt Saami and there were Russian military bases in Estonia and Finland, unlike in the Kola Peninsula.

If we compare the Russian loans of Skolt Saami with those in the Finnic languages, we notice some other clear differences. In the following, I will make some comparisons to Estonian and Finnish. I have chosen to compare Skolt Saami with Estonian and Finnish, since the Russian vocabulary of these languages has been studied better than the Russian loan vocabulary in the eastern Finnic languages (see however Pyöli 1996: 223–237 on Livvi Karelian), which can borrow new Russian loanwords to a virtually limitless extent (cf. Jarva 2003: 44).

Little agricultural vocabulary has been borrowed into Skolt Saami, with the exception of a few words related to sheep-raising and some names of animals.

- sheep-raising: *kaarât* 'trough' (KKLS 89) < *коры́то* id., *koss* 'scythe' (KKLS 149) < *косá* id., *po̭ı̄ᵛᵃ* (P, Nj) 'fodder for sheep' (KKLS 391) < *пóйво* 'fodder for cattle (archaic)', *poožn* 'meadow' (KKLS 399) < *пóжня* id., *seä'rpp* 'sickle' (KKLS 493) < *серп* id., *zåårad* 'haystack' (KKLS 515) < *зарóд* id. (6 words)

- animals: *beâllšai* 'white reindeer; gelding' (KKLS 24) < *белыш* 'name of a white animal', *skoott* 'cattle' (~KKLS 505) < *скот* id., *tee'lec* 'cow calf' (KKLS 581) < *телéц* id., *žeevai* 'animal' (KKLS 565) < *живóй* 'lively' (4 words)

On the other hand, there is a lot of vocabulary related to both animal husbandry and agriculture borrowed from Russian into the Finnic languages (see e.g. Plöger 1973: 307; Must 2000: 557–558; Blokland 2009: 361–362). The difference between the vocabulary of Skolt Saami and Estonian as well as Finnish is natural, since farming is one of the main sources of livelihood for the Estonians and Finns, but the Skolt Saami did not practice it, with the exception of some small-scale sheep-raising.

Although eastern dialects of Estonian have borrowed quite a lot of words from Russian describing the landscape related to the Peipus region, as well as weather words and names of animals, fishes, plants and mushrooms (Must 2000: 574–575; Blokland 2009: 368), the Skolt Saami have borrowed only little vocabulary related to nature, which can be explained by the fact that the nature of the Kola Peninsula was foreign to the Russians who moved from the south. In Skolt Saami, however, there are only a few weather words as well as names of animals and insects. Special mention should be made of the names of fur animals *buurairie'mjj* 'black fox' (KKLS 24) (*rie'mjj* 'fox') < *чёрнобурая лисúца* 'black fox' (*лисúца* 'fox') and *seenairie'mjj* 'blue fox' (KKLS 485) < *сúняя лисúца* 'blue fox', which are related to trade and taxation (see e.g. Mikkola 1941: 21). The fur trade may also involve *riiss* 'lynx' (KKLS 442) < *рысь* id., although its habitat extends just south of the Skolt Saami area, and apparently also *zoo'bbel* 'sable' (KKLS 541) < *сóболь* id., which probably meant some other fur animal, as sables are not found in European Russia.

- weather: *kuu'rav* 'gust of wind' (KKLS 181) < *куревá* 'blizzard with strong wind' (Durov 2011: 199), *prooidâd* 'clear (v.) (weather)' < *пройтú* 'fall (rain or snowfall)', *pogoda* 'snowstorm' (KKLS 390) < *погóда* 'weather', *vĭĕχ`χêr* 'whirlwind' (KKLS 740) < *вихрь* id., *zōвᴬ* 'ripple' (KKLS 541) < *зыбь*, *žaar* 'heat' (KKLS 565) < *жар* id. (6 words)
- animals: *jaškkrepp* 'northern goshawk' (KKLS 50) < *ястреб* 'hawk', *krääbbak̆* 'shrimp' < *крабка* 'crab', *räkk* 'crawfish' (KKLS 419) < *рак* id., *sorok ~ soorkōs* 'magpie' (KKLS 510) < *сорóка* id. (5 words)
- insects: *tseȓ̄v̄ᵉ* 'bait worm' (KKLS 631) < *червь* 'worm, maggot', *kloopp* 'bedbug' (KKLS 131) < *клоп* id., *mǫ̆šk̆ᴸᴱ* 'midge' (KKLS 261) < *мóшка* id., *tåårkan* 'cockroach' (KKLS 608) < *таракáн* id. (4 words)

## 6.  Conclusion

In this paper I have studied the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami. The Russian loan words form the largest single loan word stratum in Skolt and Kola Saami languages. Since previously there had hardly been any actual analysis of the Russian loanwords in the Saami languages, the aim of this paper was to present an overview of this loanword stratum in Skolt Saami. The Russian loanwords were studied from a phonological, morphophonological, morphological and semantic point of view.

The Russian loanwords in the Saami languages are relatively recent.[3] This can be concluded from – besides the contact history between the Saami and the Russians – the sound history of Skolt Saami, as well as the word structure of loanwords. Most of the Russian loanwords must have been borrowed into Skolt Saami after the early 17th century, because the Russian loanwords have not taken part in the denasalization that apparently spread before that time from the west to Skolt Saami.

The study revealed also that there are several Russian loanword strata of different ages in Skolt Saami that can be identified based on certain phonological features which were presented in this study, namely substitution of the Russian first-syllable vowel ‹e› and the second-syllable ‹o›. In older loans, Russian ‹e› was substituted with a diphthong, as there was no monophthong [e] in the language. After the monophthong developed in Skolt Saami, the Russian vowel ‹e› was substituted with a monophthong. If there is a labial vowel [o] in the second syllable of first foot, the word can be considered a recent Russian loan. In older loans the labial vowel has lost its roundness and become either [a] or [â]. Other criteria indicating that a loanword belongs to a more recent loanword stratum are the lack of syncope and/or apocope, as well as the lack of consonant gradation.

At least the majority of the Russian loanwords have been borrowed from the Northwestern dialects of Russian. This can be indicated by several phonological features discussed in this study: substitution of the voiced

---

3.  However, Rießler's (2022: 237–238) claim that most of the Russian loanwords have been introduced with modern-world items during or after the Soviet era, is clearly not correct, since most of the Russian loanwords have been borrowed to Skolt Saami before 1920 when the contacts between the Skolt Saami, who became Finnish citizens, and the Russians broke down. It is not plausible that most of the Russian loanwords in Kildin Saami were much more recent than in Skolt Saami.

plosive ‹г›, the affricate ‹ч›, as well as the unstressed vowel ‹о› and some cases in which [o] occurs in the Northwestern dialects in the place of ‹а› in the Standard Russian. Some loanwords, however, could also have been borrowed from Standard Russian or Southern dialects of Russian, but probably many of these words, too, were borrowed from the Northwestern dialects, which have borrowed vocabulary from the Standard Russian and southern dialects.

The nouns are mainly borrowed from the Russian nominative singular or plural forms. In this study it was revealed that the noun inflectional class which ends in a vowel, e.g. *peela* 'two-man cross-cut saw', has developed in Skolt Saami along with Russian loanwords in which the apocope has not taken place. Afterwards also Finnish loanwords have been adapted to this inflectional class.

Only some Skolt Saami verbs contain phonological features showing from which form they were borrowed. In most of those words, the loan source was the finite stem, which can be concluded from the fact that some Skolt Saami verbs verbs contain phonological features indicating it, and only in one case was the infinite form the loan source. Most of the Russian loan verbs have been adapted into the inflectional class in which the final foot of the infinite form is disyllabic and ends in the infinite suffix *-âd*; only a few have been adapted to other inflectional classes. Into this inflectional class have been adapted both Russian two-syllable verbs and longer verbs, as well as the Russian reflexive verbs, which have been integrated into Skolt Saami by adding the deverbal affix *-j-* or *-d-* and the reflexive verb suffix *-õõttâd* to the loan stem, e.g. *prǎʼšš|j|õõttâd* 'say goodbye' (KKLS 402) < *прощ|áться* id. Even though most verbs ending in *-âd* which are borrowed from Russian undergo consonant gradation, there are also a small number of verbs which do not undergo gradation. It is noteworthy that all Skolt Saami verbs ending in *-âd* which do not undergo consonant gradation, were borrowed from Russian.

The adjectives have been borrowed either from the Russian long nominative singular masculine forms or the short masculine forms. The use of masculine forms is so dominant that they are used even in compound words that were borrowed from Russian feminine adjective phrases, e.g. *strääšnaineäʼttel* 'Holy Week' (KKLS 523) < *страстнáя недéля* id., or neuter, *ro·ᴅimn̦ai-pietnᵛ* 'birth mole' (KKLS 447) < *родúмное пятнó* id.

The Russian loanword strata include words from various semantic fields, which indicates that there were extensive contacts between the Skolt

Saami and the Russians. The most important semantic fields are religion, clothing, buildings and houses, diet as well as administration and society. This is in line with Kildin Saami, too (Rießler 2009a: 401–402), which is understandable since the languages are spoken in similar surroundings and the Skolt and Kildin Saami had similar contacts with the Russians until the beginning of the 20th century. If we compare the results with studies of the Russian loanwords in Estonian and Finnish, we see some clear differences, for example Finnish and Estonian have borrowed much more vocabulary related to the natural environment than Skolt Saami. This is well understandable, since the nature in the central area where Russian is spoken is much like that in the areas where Estonian and Finnish are spoken, while in the northern areas where Skolt Saami is spoken the nature is very different.

While this study concentrated only on the Russian loanwords in Skolt Saami, much of the results can be generalized also to the Russian loanwords in the other easternmost Saami languages, since the contact situations between the Russian and the Skolt, Akkala, Kildin and Ter Saami were quite alike until the beginning of the 20th century, but an analysis of the Russian loanwords of these languages is left for a separate study.

## Acknowledgments

## References

Aikio = Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio, Ante). 2012. An essay on Saami ethnolinguistic prehistory. In Grünthal, Riho & Kallio, Petri (eds.), *A linguistic map of prehistoric Northern Europe* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 266), 63–117. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Arkhangelskiy, Timofey. 2019. Russian verbal borrowings in Udmurt. *Folia Linguistica* 53 (2). 519–552.

Bakró-Nagy, Marianne. 2018. Mansi loanword phonology: A historical approach to the typology of repair strategies of Russian loanwords in Mansi. In Bartos, Huba & den Dikken, Marcel & Bánréti, Zoltán & Váradi, Tamás (eds.), *Boundaries crossed, at the interfaces of morphosyntax, phonology, pragmatics and semantics* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 94), 51–66. Springer: Springer Cham.

Blokland, Rogier. 2009. *The Russian loanwords in literary Estonian* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 78). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Castrén, Matthias, Alexander. 2019. *Itineraria* 1 (Manuscripta Castreniana, Personalia II,1). Timo Salminen (ed.). Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Durov = Дуров, И. М. 2011. *Словарь живого поморского языка в его бытовом и этнографическом применении*. Петрозаводск: Карельский научный центр Российской академии наук, Институт языка, литературы и истории.

Eliseev & Zajceva = Елисеев, Ю. С. & Зайцева, Н. Г. 2007. *Сопоставительно-ономасиологический словарь диалектов карельского, вепсского, саамского языков*. Петрозаводск: Российская академия наук. Карельский научный центр. Институт языка, литературы и истории.

Feist, Timothy. 2015. *A grammar of Skolt Saami* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 273). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri. 2009. The Loanword Typology project and the World Loanword Database. In Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri (eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*, 1–34. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Granö, J. G. & Itkonen, T. [I.] 1918. Kulttuuri: 5. Kirkolliset ja opetusolot. In Homén, Theodor (ed.), *Itä-Karjala ja Kuollan Lappi*, 73–74. Helsinki: Otava.

InLpW = Itkonen, Erkki & Bartens, Raija & Laitinen, Lea (eds.). 1986–1991. *Inarilappisches Wörterbuch* (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XX). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Itkonen, T. [I.] 1916. *Venäjänlapin konsonanttien astevaihtelu Koltan, Kildinin ja Turjan murteiden mukaan* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XXXIX). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Itkonen, T. [I.] 1918a. Väestö ja asutus: 1. Lappalaiset. In Homén, Theodor (ed.), *Itä-Karjala ja Kuollan Lappi*, 32–35. Helsinki: Otava.

Itkonen, T. [I.] 1918b. Väestö ja asutus: 3. Venäläiset. In Homén, Theodor (ed.), *Itä-Karjala ja Kuollan Lappi*, 36–42. Helsinki: Otava.

Itkonen, T. I. 1932. Lappische Lehnwörter im Russischen. *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia* B 27. 47–65.

Itkonen, T. I. 1942. Karjalaiset ja Kuolan-Lappi. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 22. 40–55.

Itkonen, T. I. 1948. *Suomen lappalaiset vuoteen 1945* I–II. Porvoo: WSOY.

Itkonen, T. [I.] & Granö, J. G. 1918. Liikenne ja tiedonantotoiminta. In Homén, Theodor (ed.), *Itä-Karjala ja Kuollan Lappi*, 47–49. Helsinki: Otava.

Jarva, Vesa. 2003. *Venäläisperäisyys ja ekspressiivisyys suomen murteiden sanastossa* (Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 5). Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Kalima, Jalo. 1911. *Die russischen Lehnwörter im Syrjänischen* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XXIX). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Kalima, Jalo. 1952. *Slaavilaisperäinen sanastomme: Tutkimus itämerensuomalaisten kielten slaavilaisista lainasanoista* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 243). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kallio, Petri & Laakso, Johanna. 2020. Uralic and Slavic. In Greenberg, Marc L. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Slavic languages and linguistics online*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_032004 (Accessed 22.7.2022.)

Kasatkin = Касаткин, Л. Л. (ed.) 1989. *Русская диалектология*. Москва: Просвещение.

KKLS = Itkonen, T. I. 1958. *Koltan- ja kuolanlapin sanakirja* I–II (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XV). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Koponen et al. = Koponen, Eino & Miestamo, Matti & Juutinen, Markus. 2022. Skolt Saami. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 196–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1971. Ehdotus koltanlapin Suonikylän (nyk. Sevettijärven) murteen fonemaattiseksi transkriptioksi. In Itkonen, Erkki & Itkonen, Terho & Korhonen, Mikko & Sammallahti, Pekka (eds.), *Lapin murteiden fonologiaa* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 1), 69–86. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1973. Kieliopin pääkohdat. In Korhonen, Mikko & Mosnikoff, Jouni & Sammallahti, Pekka (eds.), *Koltansaamen opas* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 4), 9–98. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1977. Karjalaisten ja saamelaisten yhteydet kielentutkimuksen valossa. In Saloheimo, Veijo (ed.), *Karjalan synty: Symposio 30.6.–2.7.1976 Joensuu, Alustukset* (Monistesarja A 24a), 75–82. Joensuu: Joensuun korkeakoulu.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1981. *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 370). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Lehtiranta, Juhani & Seurujärvi-Kari, Irja. 1991. Saamelaiset. In Laakso, Johanna (ed.), *Uralilaiset kansat: tietoa suomen sukukielistä ja niiden puhujista*, 123–155. Porvoo: WSOY.

Linkola, Martti & Sammallahti, Pekka. 1995. Koltanmaa osa Saamenmaata. In Saarinen, Tuija & Suhonen, Seppo (eds.), *Koltat, karjalaiset ja setukaiset: Pienet kansat maailmojen rajoilla* (Snellman-instituutin A-sarja 19), 39–57. Kuopio: Snellman-instituutti.

Lönnrot, Elias. 1902a. *Elias Lönnrotin matkat, 1. osa: Vuosina 1828–1839* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 98:1.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Lönnrot, Elias. 1902b. *Elias Lönnrotin matkat, 2. osa: Vuosina 1851–1844* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 98:2.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Merkur'jev = Меркурьев, И. С. 1960. *Мурманский говор. (Фонетика. Вокализм)*. Мурманск: Министерство просвещения РФСФР. Мурманский государственный педагогический институт.

Merkur'jev = Меркурьев, И. С. 1962. *Мурманский говор. (Консонантизм)*. Мурманск: Министерство просвещения РФСФР. Мурманский государственный педагогический институт.

MIKKOLA, J. J. 1894. *Berührungen zwischen den westfinnischen und slavischen Sprachen, I: Slavische Lehnwörter in den west-finnischen Sprachen* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne VIII). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

MIKKOLA, J. J. 1938. *Die älteren Berührungen zwischen Ostseefinnisch und Russisch* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXV). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

MIKKOLA, J. J. 1941. *Kolttakylän arkisto* (Lapin sivistysseuran julkaisuja 8). Porvoo: WSOY.

MIXAJLOVA = Михайлова Л. П. 2007. Формальные изменения русского слова в карельских, вепсских и саамских диалектах. *Севернорусские говоры* 18. 13–28.

MOSHNIKOFF, SATU & MOSHNIKOFF, JOUNI. 2020. *Suomi–koltansaame-sanakirja*. Lehtinen, Miika & Koponen, Eino & Fofonoff, Merja & Lehtola, Raija (eds.). Aanar: Sääʹmteʹǧǧ.

MOSHNIKOFF et al. 2020. = MOSHNIKOFF, SATU & MOSHNIKOFF, JOUNI & KOPONEN, EINO & LEHTINEN, MIIKA. *Koltansaamen kielioppi*. Aanar: Sääʹmteʹǧǧ.

MUST, MARI. 2000. *Vene laensõnad eesti murretes*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

MYZNIKOV = Мызников, С. А. 2010. *Русские говоры Беломорья. Материалы для словаря*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.

OJANEN, MUUSA. 1985. *Adjektiivikategoria venäläis-lyydiläisissä kontakteissa: Lingvistinen interferenssitutkimus* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 188). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. (Doctoral dissertation.)

PINEDA = Пинеда, Давид. 2004. Некоторые наблюдения над заимствованиями в русском говоре Кольского полуострова. *Полярный Вестник* 7. 25–40.

PLÖGER, ANGELA. 1973. *Die russischen Lehnwörter der finnischen Schriftsprache* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 8). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (Doctoral dissertation.)

POST, MARGJE. 2005. *The Northern Russian pragmatic particle* dak *in the dialect of Varzuga (Kola Peninsula): An information structuring device in informal spontaneous speech*. Tromsø: Institutt for språkvitenskap, Det humanistiske fakultet, Universitetet i Tromsø. (Doctoral dissertation.)

PYÖLI, RAIJA. 1996. *Venäläistyvä aunuksenkarjala: Kielenulkoiset ja -sisäiset indikaattorit kielenvaihtotilanteessa*. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto. (Doctoral dissertation.)

RIEßLER, MICHAEL. 2009a. Loanwords in Kildin Saami, a Uralic language of northern Europe. In Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri (eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*, 384–413. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

RIEßLER, MICHAEL. 2009b. Kildin Saami vocabulary. In Haspelmath, Martin & Tadmor, Uri (eds.), *World loanword database*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wold.clld.org/vocabulary/14 (Accessed 22.7.2022.)

RIEßLER, MICHAEL. 2022. Kildin Saami. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 219–239. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rueter, Jack & Koponen, Eino. 2016. The first complete scientific grammar of Skolt Saami in English. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 63. 254–266.

Rydving, Håkan. 2013. *Words and varieties: Lexical variation in Saami* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 269). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Saarikivi, Janne. 2009. Itämerensuomalais-slaavilaisten kontaktien nykytilasta. In Ylikoski, Jussi (ed.), *The quasquicentennial of the Finno-Ugrian Society* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 258), 109–160. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1998. *The Saami languages: An Introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Sammallahti, Pekka & Mosnikoff, Jouni. 1991. *Suomi–koltansaame sanakirja*. Ohcejohka: Girjegiisá.

Sarhimaa, Anneli. 1995. Karjalan kansat ja kielet kontakteissa: Asutushistoriallista taustaa ja lingvistisiä seurauksia. *Virittäjä* 99 (2). 191–223.

Savatkova = Саваткова, А. А. 1969. *Русские заимствования в марийском языке*. Йошкар-Ола.

Senkevič-Gudkova = Сенкевич-Гудкова, В. В. 1971. Фонологическая структура русских заимствований в нотозерском диалекте саамского языка. In Керт, Г. М. & Муллонен, М. И. (eds.), *Вопросы взаимодействия прибалтийско-финских языков с иносистемными языками: К 80-летию со дня рождения Д. В. Бубриха* (Прибалтийско-финское языкознание. Вып. 5), 46–51. Ленинград: Наука.

Starowicz, Wieslaw. 1983. *A kolai-lapp nyelvjárások orosz jövevényszavai*. Debrecen: Debreceni egyetem, KLTE BTK. (Master's thesis.)

Szabó, László. 1987. Stress and consonant gradation in the Russian loanwords in Kola-Lappish. In Rédei, Károly (ed.), *Studien zur Phonologie und Morphonologie der Uralischen Sprachen: Akten der dritten Tagung für uralische Phonologie, Eisendstadt, 28. Juni–1. Juli 1984* (Studia Uralica 4), 313–319. Wien: Verband der vissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs.

Sverloff, Matti. 1989. *Suomi–koltansaame piensanasto = Suáma–sääʹm sieʹrmsäennõs*.

Tavi, Susanna. 2018. Rajakarjalaismurteiden kielikontaktit venäläiskopioiden taajuuden ja fonologian valossa. *Lähivõrdlusi = Lähivertailuja* 28. 316–356.

Tillinger, Gábor. 2014. *Samiska ord för ord: Att mäta lexikalt avstånd mellan språk* (Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 39). Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. (Doctoral dissertation.)

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A reference grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

## Appendix

The online appendix "List of Russian loan etymologies in Skolt Saami" is available at https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.110737.

*Karina Lukin*
University of Helsinki

# Between field observations, notes and knowledge: Content and contexts for M. A. Castrén's ethnographic notes and lectures[1]

This article discusses M. A. Castrén's (1803–1852) ethnographic notes and lectures on Samoyed peoples as part of the development of ethnography and Arctic research in the early 19th-century Russian Empire. Castrén produced several types of texts based on his two Russian expeditions, including travel narratives, letters, linguistic transcriptions and ethnographic notes. In addition, he gave lectures about the peoples he studied. The article describes the types of data Castrén collected, the way he organized it and subsequently presented to academic audiences. The academic and societal background of Castrén's ethnography illustrated in the article, relates him to A. J. Sjögren and to the Imperial Russian and European development of ethnography. It is argued that the tensions between nationalistic aims and broader academic discussions that split Russian discussions over ethnography represented a fruitful context for imperial subjects, such as Castrén.

## 1. Introduction

Russia saw a reawakening of Arctic research in the early 19th century after some decades of decline. Saint Petersburg, with its vibrant international academic community and some private patrons became a center for the new interest in the Arctic. Research into the Arctic was prepared, planned, instructed and promoted in the Academy of Sciences and later also in the Russian Imperial Geographical Society. The awakening was not a coincidence but took place when the results of the earlier 18th-century expeditions had been published and aroused interest in the Russian Empire and internationally. Similarly, the early 19th century represents a period of differentiation and institutionalization of several new disciplines, which is embedded not only in the development of academic discussions but also in the imperial and national ideologies within the Russian Empire. One of these new disciplines was ethnography, the methods of which were developed and discussed in Saint Petersburg – and very much used in the continuous practice of fieldwork.

The ethnography of early 19th-century Russia is inherently linked with such disciplines as history, geography, statistics, cartography and linguistics, which have been examined lately in several studies centering on individuals or separate institutions (Knight 1998; Tammiksaar 2002a; 2002b; Tammiksaar & Stone 2007; Tammiksaar & Kalling 2019; Suxova 2020; Gibson 2022: 47–97). This article continues to uncover the practices and methods of the developing field and it focuses on Matthias Alexander Castrén (1813–1852) and his relationship with Anders Johan Sjögren (Andrej Mixailovič Šëgren, 1794–1855), who can be considered a teacher and a patron to Castrén at the Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg.

I have used two different kinds of texts as key materials for this article. First, contained within the collections of Castrén in the National Library of Finland there is a manuscript titled *Ethnographiska, historiska och statistiska anmärkningar* (KK Coll. 593.13.1), which focuses on the Samoyedic-speaking linguistic communities. There are also ethnographic notes on Nenets scattered across various locations in the Jurak-Samoiedica section of the *Manuscripta Castreniana* collection. These two sources will be published together in the forthcoming scholarly electronic edition *Manuscripta Castreniana Jurak-Samoiedica Ethnographica*. The texts represent Castrén's notes that he wrote in the course of his fieldwork in order to collect and organize the data, and they were not intended for

publication. The notes constitute a fascinating piece of research history, and they enable us to evaluate Castrén's fieldwork methods, especially pertaining to his writing and organization of research notes. The manuscripts also provide a key to understanding what constituted data for Castrén and what type of ethnography he intended to create. This enables us to obtain a more general understanding of ethnography at the time. Another key to Castrén's understanding of ethnography is the finished (and more complete) publication of his lectures on ethnology held at the Imperial Alexander University in Helsinki (Finland) in May 1851. Although not intended for publication, the lectures were posthumously published in Swedish and in German translation in 1857 (Castrén 1857a; 1857b).

In the following, I will evaluate Castrén's ideas about ethnography and doing fieldwork and examine the above-mentioned materials together with other field notes and the published volume of *Ethnologiska föreläsningar öfver altaiska folken; samt Samojediska och tatariska sagor* (Castrén 1857a). It should be noted that the types of fieldnotes being published and discussed are more numerous in Castrén's diaries and travelogues, which have already been edited by Timo Salminen and published under the *Manuscripta Castreniana* series (Castrén 2019a; 2019b). These will be considered in relation to the Samoyedic-speaking linguistic communities; the abundant notes concerning other ethnic groups are outside the scope of this study.

There are two overriding aims of this study: to describe the content and structure of Castrén's notes and to discuss how they relate to the practices of ethnography and the international debate regarding them. I aim to contextualize his work within early 19th-century discussions on research into the Arctic and non-Russian peoples, and within what for Castrén represented a fruitful tension between "science of empire" and "science of nationality" (Knight 1998: 117). Further, the different types of notes and emerging voices will be specified, and I will argue that these voices are not only those of Castrén or his informants. Without doubt, these notes also encompass more detailed academic and societal discussions, which also determine what is listened to, watched and recorded. In other words, this raises the question of what constitutes appropriate ethnographic data. My point of departure is that despite the sense of immediacy and authenticity, fieldnotes should always be read as a result of selections, narration, contextualization and translations orchestrated by the ethnographer. They make their decisions based on the flow of events in the field, their own

capabilities and understandings, and between the aim of the fieldwork and how the field has been described previously. Moreover, similar processes govern the ethnographic writing itself (Thornton 1983; Appadurai 1986).

In the following, I will initially provide a general overview of Castrén and his fieldwork, after which I will set them against their contemporary academic background. Subsequently, in Section 3 I will relate Castrén's work to the wider Russian and European debates about ethnography by discussing the instructions given to Castrén, as compared to the instructions given to earlier expeditions. The following discussion on Castrén's notes will focus on their relation to the contemporary and historical background, and I aim to show how the idea of appropriate ethnographic data is reflected in the notes of Castrén. In the fifth section, I will discuss Castrén's ethnological lectures and their relation to ethnography, after which I will draw conclusions.

## 2. National and imperial interests intertwined

The ethnographic notes of Castrén are connected to two different expeditions, which are related to the plans of the Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg to study Western Siberia at the beginning of the 19th century. The first expedition took place between 1841 and 1844 and the second from 1845 to 1849. Timo Salminen (2019b; 2019c) has thoroughly described the two expeditions, and I will not dwell on them in this article. Here, it is sufficient to note that during the first expedition Castrén traveled through the Arctic regions of European Russia, across the Ural mountains to Obdorsk (contemporary Salekhard), from where he started to travel south and eventually west, returning to Helsinki. Castrén started the expedition after traveling with the doctor, linguist and folklorist Elias Lönnrot (1802–1884) in Lapland and arriving at Arkhangelsk, where he discovered that he had received funding to study the Samoyedic languages. The second journey took Castrén to the Yenisei River, after which he traveled to the Sayan Mountains, Irkutsk and Nerčinsk. From there, he embarked on his journey back to Helsinki.

The two expeditions can be related to the Academy of Sciences' research interests in the Russian Arctic. The Academy began to discuss and prepare for an expedition to western Siberia in 1838. This was the initiative of academician Karl von Baer (Karl Maksimovič Bèr, 1792–1876), who had been elected as the second zoologist of the Academy of Sciences in

Saint Petersburg in 1834 and had focused since on the physical geography of the Arctic regions. According to Tammiksaar (2002b: 124), von Baer was not only traveling himself, but his role was instrumental in planning and promoting other researchers' expeditions and making Saint Petersburg a center for geography in Russia. Von Baer was interested in the flora and fauna of the continental areas of the Arctic, and his plans were to head for the Taimyr Peninsula and the Lower Tunguska. He worked tirelessly for the plan: he set the general goals, worked with earlier archival documents and laid the academic, industrial and economic groundwork.

Although the expedition was to be scientific, a linguist-ethnographer was also added to the list of participants during the preparation. At that time, Sjögren was working as a supernumerary academician in the Academy and refused to leave, finding M. A. Castrén suitable for the task. (Sjögren 1854: 242, 250–252; Branch 1968: 339–340; Tammiksaar & Stone 2007; Laine 2020: 102–105). Over the ensuing months and years, the expedition was prepared and planned. Ultimately, it was decided that a naturalist and a linguist-ethnographer would embark on separate journeys to the same regions. The plan was accepted by the Academy towards the end of 1841. At that time, Castrén was already in the north. The naturalist Alexander Theodor von Middendorff (1815–1894), who had earlier traveled with von Baer, was accepted to be the main researcher of the expedition, and he started his expedition in November 1842, arriving back to Saint Petersburg in March 1845 (Tammiksaar & Stone 2007: 196–202). Sjögren postponed the linguistic-ethnographic expedition while also trying to attract more funding. He managed to arrange funding for Castrén's first northern expedition (1841–1844) from the Alexander University in Helsinki. However, during this delay at the beginning of the planned linguistic-ethnographic expedition, another candidate – the Hungarian Antal Réguly (1819–1858) – appeared in Saint Petersburg, and Sjögren used all his powers and means of persuasion to ensure that Castrén was chosen for the expedition. (See, e.g., Sjögren 1844; Sjögren 1854: 250–252; Branch 1968: 338–346; Laine 2020: 102–105; 117–118; 124–135.) Castrén was finally able to begin his second expedition, which formed part of the Academy's plan, in 1845.

There were several interests related to the excursion. The initial idea by von Baer focused on natural sciences (Tammiksaar 2009: 142–147; Bassin 2009: 79–84). However, von Baer enthusiastically promoted ethnography and did not oppose the inclusion of a linguist-ethnographer in the expedition. However, because ethnography was still developing at the time, there

were several emphases about the nature of ethnography at play. As has been shown by Tammiksaar and Kalling (2019), von Baer's own ethnographic interests focused on physical anthropology and the general development of humankind. Related to his way of thinking was von Baer's belief that the northern peoples would not survive the processes of colonization and modernization, which made him a keen supporter of collecting as much data as possible concerning the non-Russian peoples of the north.

Another academician who had an interest in planning and promoting further ethnographic research in the north was Peter von Köppen (Pëtr Ivanovič Kèppen, 1793–1864), who wrote supplementary instructions for Castrén's expedition. Köppen was a statistician and cartographer, and he was interested in spatially visualizing the numerical and descriptive knowledge about the Russian Empire's population in order to better understand it and render visual the limits of knowledge (Suxova 1993; Gibson 2022: 49–51). His instructions for Castrén have six parts: first, Castrén should define the classification of the people he met according to the newly defined classes under the so-called Speransky reforms, which classified the Siberian non-Russians, *inorodcy*, into three categories.[2] Second, Castrén should determine the specific areas in which each people (*Stamm*) resided and the number of separate populations. Castrén was also given specific questions about certain ethnic groups and subsequently instructed to diligently record ethnographic and geographical names (Parts 3 and 4). Fifthly, Köppen points Castrén to some specific rock paintings. Last, he instructs Castrén to pay special attention to the Ljamin Sor river basin and its different peoples (von Köppen 1844). The instructions are informed by previous knowledge obtained mainly from Siberian administrators, and Köppen insists on clarifying classifications and specifying the relations of the peoples, their living areas and their number. Both Köppen's and von Baer's interests were related to international and Imperial Russian academic and national-administrative discussions that simultaneously served the benefits of the Russian Empire and scholarly research. Sjögren was involved in these discussions, but his interest in ethnography provides a third kind of subprogram.

Sjögren had developed a holistic methodology for linguistically and ethnographically oriented fieldwork that was original and aroused great

---

2. *Ustav ob upravlenii inorodcev* (1822) and *Ustav ob upravlenii Samoedami, obitajuščimi v Mezenskom uezde Arhangel'skoj gubernii* (1835) for the European Nenets. For more information, see e.g. Forsyth 1992: 156–158.

interest in Saint Petersburg. It combined internationally debated questions on the history of language, ethnic groups and humanity with an interest in the description of the histories of certain ethnolinguistic groups and language families. In addition, Sjögren's Finnish background and enthusiasm for language, oral poetry and regional description certainly influenced his work. Michael Branch (1973) and Päivi Laine (2020) have defined Sjögren's academic work as Hegelian-Herderian, emphasizing Romanticism and the concept of language as a source of history. They also emphasize the importance of Rasmus Rask and the brothers Grimm in the development of these methodologies. As indicated by Michael Branch (1973), Sjögren introduced a methodological "kit" that combined careful reading of archival sources with historical and comparative linguistics, onomastics and description of customs, manners and oral traditions. In other words, he presented ethnography, linguistics and onomastics as auxiliaries to history. Sjögren's travelogue can be considered one of the first publications representing this methodology, and he states his sources as follows:

> […] in the absence of older historical documents, I consider non-Russian words and idioms that have remained from older settings in the Russian language, which has now become common, as well as non-Russian place names – together with customs and traditions – combined with local knowledge expanded to the best of one's ability. (Sjögren 1861: 78)

It is clear that Sjögren emphasizes the role of comparative and historical linguistics and ethnography in cases where no written evidence is available. The originality of Sjögren's method is indeed related to his insistence on studying language and linguistic expressions. In addition, it is vital to situate him in the wider discussions taking place in Saint Petersburg: the above-mentioned imperial needs for maps and descriptions of lands and peoples and the international scholarly debate around the history of humankind.

A brief comparison of von Baer's, Köppen's and Sjögren's points of departure for ethnography demonstrates how imperial interests intertwined with scientific and academic justifications and national interests culminated in a situation where different ideologies met developing disciplines, creating a desire to know more. This complexity is well represented in Sjögren, who (similar to von Baer) justified the linguistic-ethnographic journey with added knowledge about Russia and its population and landscape, while also promoting the Finnish cause (Branch 1973; Laine 2020: 117–118).

The simultaneous aims of serving both the empire and its colony did not present a difficulty for Sjögren's research program. Nevertheless, a similar arrangement caused severe tensions in the Russian Imperial Geographical Society that was founded in 1845 in the blooming atmosphere after Middendorf's return from his successful expedition. The Society was quite soon divided between those who emphasized ethnography as the study of non-Russian peoples and the importance of mapping and gathering data about them, on the one hand, and those who placed more of a focus on studying Russian peasants and other Slavic peoples in order to define the nature of Russianness, on the other. Nathaniel Knight (2009) has argued that the consequent focus on Russians not only narrowed the research, it also hampered theoretical discussions in ethnography, which came to emphasize description over theorizing.

In this regard, Sjögren and Castrén were working in a border zone as imperial subjects, representing the freshly colonized Finns, and as researchers for the Academy of Sciences. Their points of departure were characterized by national aims to build and depict the history of the Finns and Finland, which they both achieved using the same, internationally developing methodology. There are also differences between Sjögren and Castrén in this regard. Sjögren spent most of his career in Saint Petersburg, he became a loyal Russian subject (Laine 2020: 223) and his main audience was in Russia or in the academic circles of Europe. He advocated the study of the Finno-Ugrian peoples for the sake of Russian history (Branch 1973: 196). By comparison, it is obvious that Castrén's implied audience was mostly in Finland, despite his numerous articles published in Russian journals and the international significance of his work. This is inferred by the recurrent use of "we" and "our" in his lectures (e.g. "our runosongs") and the explicit aim to write Finnish history. This is apparent, for example, from Castrén's later writings and in the letter he penned to Sjögren to indicate his enthusiasm for the journey, where he states that the expedition primarily represents for him the possibility of studying the history of Finnish and the Finns (especially Finnish mythology) (Castrén 2021: 91). Consequently, the non-Russians that were not in the focus of the Russian Geographical Society, were relatives and non-others to Sjögren and Castrén. What is more, the two men did produce analytical research on the data collected. In other words, they did not stick to mere description, as in the reports of the Geographical Society. The Academy together with international scholarly debate provided a fruitful arena for their research.

## 3. Instructions for fieldwork

One of the arenas for developing methods and research agendas in the early 19th-century Russian academic debates were the instructions drawn up for the expeditions. In the following, I will discuss the instructions written for Castrén and relate them to the earlier Russian fieldwork traditions. The aim is to show the decisive influence of Sjögren on Castrén's work and to contextualize the research program historically.

When Sjögren sought to attract funding for Castrén's second excursion, he wrote detailed instructions and read them at a session of the Academy. The instructions were published in German in the *Bulletin de la Classe historico-philologique de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* (Sjögren 1844). They were also translated into Swedish and attached as an appendix to the second volume of *Nordiska resor och forskningar* (Castrén 1855: 447–457). The instructions were not only guidelines for fieldwork, they also provided an academic background for the expedition, including references to previous researchers and their results. Klaproth's *Asia polyglotta* (1823), Stepanov's *Enisejskaja gubernija* (1835) and Pallas's *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Rußischen Reichs* (1771–1776) were the three central works cited when considering the northern areas of Castrén's expedition.[3] Sjögren pointed out the inconsistencies in the works of orientalist Heinrich Julius Klaproth (1783–1835) and Governor Aleksandr Petrovič Stepanov (1781–1837) and insisted that Castrén could provide a clearer picture of the peoples living in the regions between the Ob and Yenisei, the languages they spoke and their linguistic and historical relationships. In addition, Sjögren criticized previous research that relied on narrow, insufficient collections of words or glossaries. Instead, Castrén would study these peoples diligently and correct any earlier and contemporary discrepancies and limitations (Sjögren 1844; also Castrén 1857a: 448–451). I should emphasize that Sjögren's remarks are not only a criticism of the previous works. They represent a central means of setting the expedition into a relevant Russian academic context and justifying it based on the contemporary and historical state-of-the-art. In this sense, the instructions follow the rhetoric of the Academy like the instructions drawn by Köppen: they show the limits of previous knowledge and the ways in which these limits could be transcended.

---

3. Fischer's *Sibirische Geschichte* and Spasskij's article in *Sibirskij vestnik* 1819 are mentioned in relation to the southern regions.

The instructions focus on three general points: what, how and from whom to collect. The first focuses on the different types of linguistic and ethnographic data to be collected, while the second and third points suggest gathering the data among the peoples themselves, in the place where they live and from capable individuals (*an Ort und Stelle durch kundige Personen*; Sjögren 1844: 326). For example, Sjögren writes:

> [...] that he should travel in person to the regions of every tribe and move there completely so that he would get to know them and their mutual relations – if this can be said about wandering nomadic peoples – through his own observations. (Sjögren 1844: 326)

The only exception to this in the instructions is the statistical data, which should be based on the knowledge of reliable people. Furthermore, the instructions clearly focus on linguistic data. Towards the end of the instructions Sjögren begins to list non-linguistic *desiderata*. These include place names and general details that would enhance the geographical and topographical knowledge of the region. This includes roads, settlements of all kinds, natural places (mountains, rivers, streams, lakes) and their qualities, and general notions about the climate and flora. Sjögren also mentions archaeological sites and any narratives related with them. He subsequently mentions the ethnographic objectives of writing:

> [...] so that he, through his own eyes and acquisition, learns to fully know the physical build, way of life, clothing, customs and manners, cultural level and religious concepts of the respective peoples, as well everything that can serve to characterize them as such in all their peculiarities. (Sjögren 1844: 332)

There are two points that I would like to emphasize. The first is the reliance on firsthand knowledge and observations, which ties neatly into Enlightenment empiricism and the historical and comparative method. From the perspective of linguistic research, this emphasis has to be read as a criticism directed at earlier practices and the long tradition of reliance on secondhand data (especially certain word lists), regardless of their comprehensive nature (Korhonen 1986: 40–41; Campbell 2002). The new historical and comparative method, which was at the heart of Sjögren's thinking, demanded more than mere vocabulary items. The aim was to uncover smaller details, such as phonemes and larger wholes (e.g. different forms and neighboring variants) (Campbell 2002). Sjögren constantly returned to this point during his work in the Academy and the Russian Geographical

Society (e.g. Knight 2009: 127). Secondly, the comprehensive nature of the details to be collected, also typical for the Enlightenment, should be noted.

I have emphasized the Enlightenment in order to relate the early 19th-century discussion to the earlier 18th-century Russian expeditions. While the linguistic and ethnographic research of the early 19th century was generally directed towards history, geography provided another point of reference for the developing fields. The historical interest was directed towards comparisons, which would result in a better understanding of world history or the history of humanity. These thoughts were born of 18th-century Germany, and their empirical basis resides in Russia's lands and peoples on which several large expeditions were carried out during the 18th century. The results of the expeditions came to bear fruit in publications and consequent debates, so that the idea of organizing humanity into different *Völker*, peoples, was further developed into *Völker-beschreibung*, i.e ethnography or ethnology. While the results of the expeditions were published and discussed by August Ludwig von Schlözer (1735–1809), the methods of gathering the data were explicitly developed by Gerhard Friedrich Müller (1705–1783). Schlözer's influence on Finnish academic traditions (and on Sjögren) is undeniable and clear (see Korhonen 1986: 29–33; Branch 1973: 23–26; Siikala & Ulyashev 2011: 34–35). Elsewhere, I have discussed its connections to Castrén's work, with the aim of demonstrating that Castrén and Sjögren constitute an integral part of this program (Lukin 2017).

Herein, I would like to concentrate on Müller who was the main person responsible for the geographical and historical section of the so-called Second Kamchatka Expedition or the Great Northern Expedition (1733–1743) which aimed at mapping the coastline of Siberia. Müller wrote detailed instructions for the collection of materials, and his instructions provide an important epistemic link between earlier Russian expeditions (and their traditions) and the Russian ethnography of the early 19th century. Vermeulen (2015: 171–175) emphasizes this link, and he especially insisted on Müller's legacy for the subsequent development of ethnography as a program for describing the world's peoples and as a method of staying among those peoples and collecting knowledge about them directly. The idea was both historical and comparative, and it developed from the idea that each community has its own living area and history into an all-encompassing concept of describing those histories and nations in relation to each other. As shown by Vermeulen, the aim of Müller was to be create a comprehensive program in order to systematically describe and compare peoples,

including their histories, customs, and manners. It is also noteworthy that Müller emphasized fieldwork practices such as communicating with people, which came to be termed *rapport* in modern anthropology.

It is apparent that the work of Müller did not have a straightforward effect on Russian academia in the 19th century. However, its influence can be traced through the works of the late 18th-century expeditionaries, such as Johann Eberhard Fischer (1697–1771), Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811) and Ivan Ivanovič Lepëxin (1740–1802). Müller wrote instructions for Fischer, who received them during his expedition in 1740. Fischer later published *Sibirische Geschichte von der Entdeckung Sibiriens bis auf die Eroberung dieses Landes durch die russischen Waffen* (1768), which is "largely based on Müller's research" and "addresses seven fields: history, ethnography, linguistics, geography, archaeology, statistics and physical anthropology." (See Vermeulen 2015: 186–187.) Peter Simon Pallas, again, prepared the instructions for the Academy's expeditions of 1768–1774 in which, for example, Ivan Lepëxin and Johann Gottlied Georgi (1729–1802) took part. As has been noted, the expedition was not initially supposed to study peoples or their languages, and it has been concluded that both the idea of this and the implementation of the instructions speaks to the heavy influence of Müller (Bucher 2009). Both Castrén and Sjögren cite Fischer and Pallas often, aiming to enlarge and deepen the knowledge they had produced. Additionally, the influence of the Müllerian *Völkerbeschreibung* can be traced by comparing the instructions for the fieldwork. For example, in the latest instructions written by Müller there are six parts, of which the first is focused on keeping a journal, the second on geographical description, the third on towns and their surroundings, the fourth on working in the archives and the fifth on antiquities. The sixth and largest section centered on the manners and customs of peoples and documentation pertaining to this. According to Vermeulen,

> [the] list of ethnographic items to be studied in Siberia is systematic and exhaustive. It moves from "external" (visible) items, such as outward appearance, clothing, and housing, via languages and physical constitution, to "internal" (invisible) items, such as indigenous knowledge, beliefs, and so on. In between were subjects such as war and economy, rites of passage, and the education of children. (Vermeulen 2015: 167–169)

I have compared Müller's instructions to the structure of Castrén's notebooks and to one of Sjögren's most influential monographs in Table 1, and I will come back to them together at the end of the next chapter. For the

time being, it is important to note how similar Sjögren's instructions are to Müller's program, not only in their moving from external to internal data to be collected but also the emphasis on the systematicity and comprehensiveness. In addition, Sjögren does not follow only the ethnographical, sixth part of the program but seems to take note also of the other five parts. In this way, Sjögren's program aims at a description of the history of humanity based on the detailed data collected. Within this academic framework, Sjögren together with Castrén chose to focus on the speakers of languages related to Finnish. Sjögren also developed the program by combining it with the linguistic program to describe the history of the humanity through detailed study of languages and dialects.

## 4. Making notes

It is difficult to find any detailed guidelines for making notes in the instructions written by Sjögren. Indeed, as noted by subsequent anthropologists, the manner, scope, and organization of making notes was seldom included in formal teaching. Moreover, for a long time, these matters were considered part of every ethnographer's personal expertise based on the ethnographer's interests, experiences and academic background (Jackson 1990). This silence around fieldwork methodologies and practices (or tacit knowledge) also prevailed in Finno-Ugrian studies, the research tradition that developed as a legacy of the work of Castrén and Sjögren among others. It was customary for researchers in Finno-Ugrian studies to write travelogues, where encounters with informants were described. However, researchers did not develop a systematic interest in fieldwork practices in their writing (Grünthal 2010; Stipa 1990). Accordingly, it would be interesting to compare Sjögren's instructions with the notes taken by Castrén during his expedition.

The manuscript *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar* consists of such fieldnotes. It is presented in a black binder notebook 22 cm in height and comprises 272 pages, 116 of which contain text. The notebook is placed under the unit titled Samoiedica 7: Jurak-Samoiedica 6 in the Castrén manuscript collections at the National Library of Finland (KK Coll. 539.13.1). The text in the manuscript is divided into seven chapters. Although these chapters have no titles, Castrén listed the contents of each chapter on a dedicated Contents page of the manuscript. Indeed, the contents page provides us with valuable clues about the concept of the manuscript. This is important, as some details are not provided in the text.

Table 1: The structure of Castrén's *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar* compared to Sjögren's *Die Syrjänen, ein historisch-statistisch-philologischer Versuch* (1861) and Müller's *Unterricht, was bey Beschreibung der Völker, absonderlich der Sibirischen in acht zu nehmen* (1740).

| Castrén: *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar*[4] | Sjögren: *Die Syrjänen, ein historisch-statistisch-philologischer Versuch*[5] | Müller: *Unterricht, was bey Beschreibung der Völker, absonderlich der Sibirischen in acht zu nehmen*[6] |
|---|---|---|
| Chapter I:<br>The location of places<br>The qualities of places<br>Mountains, rivers, lakes and seas<br>Soil<br>Seasons<br>Climate<br>Naturalia: fish, birds, trees, berries<br>Domestic animals | I. Places and physical characteristics<br>II. Climate | II. Geographical description<br>III. Contemporary situation of towns and their environs |
| Chapter II:<br>Nutrition<br>The way of living<br>  a) in summer<br>  b) in winter<br>Reindeer and reindeer herding<br>Reindeer marks<br>Names of reindeer in different times<br>Means of transport, reindeer decoration<br>Boats<br>Deer hunting<br>Hunting in general<br>Fishing equipment | III. Industry and livelihood | VI. Manners and customs:<br>Commerce, crop cultivation<br>Animal husbandry<br>Transportation overland<br>Transportation by water<br>Hunting<br>Fishery<br>Utensils |

4. KK Coll. 539.13.1
5. Sjögren 1861: 233–459.
6. Document cited in Vermeulen 2015: 167–170; available in the archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg.

| Castrén: *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar*[4] | Sjögren: *Die Syrjänen, ein historisch-statistisch-philologischer Versuch*[5] | Müller: *Unterricht, was bey Beschreibung der Völker, absonderlich der Sibirischen in acht zu nehmen*[6] |
|---|---|---|
| Chapter III:<br>Home and dwelling places<br>Clothing<br>Food and cooking | VI. Contemporary population | VI. Manners and customs:<br>Clothing<br>Housing<br>Cooking, victuals and stimulants |
| Chapter IV:<br>Marriage (weddings, the baptism of children, and names)<br>Law of inheritance<br>Burial<br>Servants | VI. Contemporary population | VI. Manners and customs:<br>Marriage, child rearing<br>Life span, (illness), death, burials, inheritance laws |
| Chapter V:<br>National character<br>Socialising<br>Ways of greeting<br>Home medicine<br>Skills in general<br>Signatures | VI. Contemporary population | VI. Manners and customs:<br>Medicine<br>Morality<br>Political constitution<br>Judiciary, oath, documents<br>Social and personal interaction |
| Chapter VI:<br>Mythology<br>Magic<br>Urier [a Nenets spirit]<br>Conversion to Christianity | VI. Contemporary population | VI. Manners and customs:<br>Religious representations<br>Pagan peoples, shamanism<br>Christianity |
| Chapter VII:<br>Ancient and contemporary society<br>Administration<br>Memories | IV. Distribution and population<br>V. History and historical remains | V. Antiquities<br>VI. Manners and customs:<br>Political constitution |

The subtitles of the chapters are listed in Table 1, and I shall here briefly describe the contents of each chapter. The first chapter describes the (physical) geography and fauna of the area under study. The chapter begins by providing the exact location of Kanin Nos at the northwestern end of the

Kanin Peninsula. While there were some Nenets living west of the Kanin Peninsula, it can be inferred that Castrén traveled here to identify the westernmost location where the Nenets lived. Castrén continues by describing the lakes, rivers, mountains and general geographic characteristics of the peninsula. He mentions a highland watershed called Timanskij Kamen′ (today Timanskij Krjaž), the Timanskaja tundra, and Malaja Zemlja, providing knowledge of the soil and forests in the region. The description follows major and minor rivers and their associated villages.

On page nine, Castrén provides a list of Nenets families in the Mezen′ district (*krets*) in the *slobodas* of Pustozersk, Ust′-Cylma and Ižma. This is followed by tables that list the population numerically and the amount of tax paid in furs, the so-called *yasak*. The chapter continues by supplying details about the livelihoods of the Nenets, complete with comparisons between the western Timan and Bol′šezemelskaja Nenets. Further, the descriptions of the *naturalia* from the Nenets perspective emphasize the species that were hunted, fished or gathered and the ways in which these practices occurred. On page 30, the manuscript describes the so-called Obdorsk Samoyed, referring to the Nenets living on the eastern side of the Ural Mountains. However, once again this section lacks any detailed lists of places, rivers and lakes or any population tables. The tables can be found at the end of the notebook, indicating they were a part of notes not yet processed by Castrén.

The second chapter's notes focus on reindeer. When Castrén describes their food, he emphasizes the place of reindeer meat in the Nenets diet. He also highlights the passion of the Nenets for butter and milk, rendering it "probable that the Samoyeds will little by little leave the nomadic lifestyle, settle down and indulge in cattle keeping" (p. 49). Castrén also briefly discusses reindeer diseases and the mass deaths of Timan reindeer in 1828. After making a brief tangent on women's spatial behavior (and their status in the camp) and name-giving, Castrén returns to the chapter's theme on page 90 by providing a detailed description of the harnessing of reindeer to sledges.

The third chapter's notes provide a fairly comprehensive overview of Nenets clothing, followed by a description of the conical tent. Fragmentary notions about work are then presented, with details about the knife, cooking and eating habits, as well as women's work in the tent. Similarly, Chapter 4 is very limited in length. On pages 121–122, Castrén describes customs related to marriage proposals and the bride-price, while page 137

contains notes on childbirth, 144 names scattered details about marriage and burial.

The fifth chapter's themes weave around Nenets society at large, but the actual notes only comprise four pages (145–148) and describe the national character. Page 155 names a few sicknesses. "National character" is a Herderian notion that allowed Castrén to characterize the peoples' peculiar nature, traits that were thought to be shared by some ethnic community, such as timidity or laziness. Chapter 6, focusing on religion, presents more data. The chapter begins with a myth about Urier, a man who climbed to heaven and became a thunder-related spirit. According to the myth, he can be seen on the Ural Mountains. In a few places, Castrén lists details about the island of Vaigač, which has become famous as one of the largest sacrificial sites of the Nenets. There are also notes about burials, sacrifices, shamans and shamanic rituals, as well as interesting inscriptions of prayers. Castrén also made notes about the Nenets idols. Finally, page 184 contains a few notes about Christianization and education among the Nenets.

Chapter 7 has subtitles referring to ancient and contemporary society, administration and memories, consisting of text that describes different Samoyed branches. Some of the pages are presented upside down and are not related to the chapter themes, rendering it difficult to follow the intended order of the pages. However, most of the text is easily interpreted, especially if one understands the unrelated pages as jottings made in the course of fieldwork on the next empty, available page. In the pages related to society, Castrén initially describes the Natsko-Pumpokol′sk Volost′ in the upper reaches of the Ket, then proceeds to what he terms the Narym Samoyed and Ket Samoyed, Kondin (or Kazym) Samoyed, Ljamin Samoyed, and Obdorsk Samoyed. Additionally, there are notes about the Kanin and Timan Nenets. The descriptions tend to follow a certain scheme, where Castrén gives the geographical location and then proceeds to talk about the ways of life, dwellings, clothing and possible customs related to the land, hunting and fishing. He also mentions religion and education, including vernacular religion and possible Christianity. The descriptions include place names (mostly villages and rivers) together with speculative etymologies, lists of foods eaten and diseases. Castrén also describes the *starshina* institution and talks about the status of the Ostyak prince in the Obdorsk area. Eventually, these notes also mention the Selkup, Forest and Tundra Nenets communities in Western Siberia. The notes about the

Kanin, Timan and Bol′šezmelskaja Nenets at the beginning of the manuscript would probably find an appropriate place in this chapter.

As mentioned previously, in addition to the notes under these titles, there are some scattered notes at the end of the notebook. Some of these are upside down, indicating that they were either written in a hurry or were too long to be written within the chapters. These represent the type of notes that can be found scattered in other parts of the Jurak-Samoiedica manuscript collections. We can also find details about vernacular religion (such as prayers) and notes on sacred places and Christianization, lists of place names (and their related etymologies), and lists of families (including statistics) within these jottings. The manuscript ends with a list of place names and their distances in Castrén's 1841–1844 journey. This list, and the fact that the notes cover only Samoyed communities living in Western Siberia, suggest that the notebook was only used during the first journey. However, some of the fragmented notes may be related to the latter journey.

Overall, I consider that the manuscript and fragmented notes represent texts that have been termed field notes by anthropologists. More specifically, I posit that the texts represent the early parts of the fieldwork and knowledge-production processes and were not intended to be published. Similar notes can also be found within Castrén's manuscript collections in other places. For example, *Ostjaker vid Irtisch* (KK Coll 593.5.6) and *Ostjaker wid nedra Ob* (KK Coll. 593.5.7) represent analogous notes on Khanty. In particular, the notebooks kept at the Society of Swedish Literature in Finland (Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland) are interesting in this respect (Castrén 2019a: 598–609; 2019b: 966 *et passim*). As mentioned, some of Castrén's field notes have already been published and edited by Timo Salminen in *Itineraria 1–2* (Castrén 2019a; 2019b). It is noteworthy that the logbook-type short jottings tend to be typical of the first journey, while Castrén wrote more letters and travel narratives during the second journey, suggesting the latter were ready for publication. In addition to the travel narratives, letters and logbook-type diaries, Castrén also made linguistic notes consisting of grammar, meaning paradigms collected through elicitation, vocabularies and folklore, similarly collected through elicitation.

Castrén is best known for his travel narratives or travelogues that were published in newspapers and in the *Bulletin* of the Russian Academy of Sciences at the time of his travels. Castrén subsequently put together a travelogue based on those writings (Castrén 1852). It is interesting that the travel

narratives were mostly written in the form of letters to Castrén's friends or his supporter and mentor Sjögren. They are written in the first-person singular and their tone is colloquial, and from time to time they turn into detailed descriptions of events encountered or general characterizations of peoples and their cultures. Elsewhere, I have analyzed them as travelogues and discussed the interrelation between the epistolary and travel-narrative formats (Lukin, forthcoming). Here, I would like to note that Castrén seems to have written the letters both to report his research (Branch 1968: 343–344; Laine 2020: 128, 131) and to produce and distribute ethnographic knowledge. The letter travel narratives often constitute the only source for this knowledge, and it is remarkable how few changes Castrén made when he later edited the text (Salminen 2019a: 12). It would appear that Castrén recalled the letter travel narratives purely from memory, as they do not repeat the details found in the notebooks.

The notebooks formed during the expedition (Castrén 2019a; 2019b) can be described as log books, where Castrén noted down his travel routes and dates together with the names of the Finnish or Russian people he had encountered. Among these, one can find something that Castrén himself sometimes terms *Hvarjehanda anmärkningar* (miscellaneous notes). They are sometimes short jottings which he subsequently expanded. In addition, there are many lists of place names, words, statistical data about the number of people in different locations, notes or descriptions concerning modes of living, means of livelihood, religion, shamanism and oral traditions. Furthermore, the letter travel narratives can also be found in the notebooks. These types of travel diaries from all of Castrén's expeditions have been preserved, except for the period from autumn 1845 to spring 1846 (see Salminen's Note 1788 in Castrén 2019b: 1126). The notes are also similar to the fragmented minutes that Castrén hastily wrote in between linguistic transcriptions.

However, the notes in the manuscript *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar* have a more ambiguous character. Some text is well phrased and formed, and one could imagine these being published. For example, Castrén's careful description of Nenets clothing or the structure of the conical tent represent notes that seem to have been finalized. Nevertheless, most of the notes represent isolated observations and points. They are isolated in the sense of being individual remarks about some custom (such as burial) and could be separated from other notes by several empty pages. Superficially, it may seem that the manuscript forms a

framework for a monograph, which was my initial thought when I started working with the manuscript. However, compared to the manuscript with logbook-type diaries, it is clear that Castrén used *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska Anmärkningar* to arrange his non-linguistic remarks within the scheme provided on the Contents page. As the fieldwork continued, the notes adopted a more fragmented form and it also seems that Castrén began to write more notes that could not find their place in the notebook structure. This reflects the social situations in fieldwork, where one can suddenly encounter interesting details and rush to jot them down. Accordingly, the notebook is a mixture of ordered and unordered notes. I would consider it an effective representation of the practice of ethnographic fieldwork, especially the reality of where neat and orderly scientific classifications meet the everyday life of ethnographers in the field.

To make sense of the data, one can categorize Castrén's notes using James Clifford's (1990) simple (but extremely valid) categories *inscription*, *transcription* and *description*. Although Clifford's classification is based on the understandings of ethnographic fieldwork, it is sensitive to linguistically oriented research. By the term *inscription* Clifford refers to the kinds of notes one makes "in the midst of competing, distracting messages and influences" (Clifford 1990: 54). Initially, they can be mental notes (headnotes) or jottings (scratch notes) that are subsequently written or rewritten as descriptions (see also Sanjek 1990: 93–99). Once again, the *descriptions* constitute "the makings of a more or less coherent representation of an observed cultural reality", meaning they are rough and unfinished raw material for a finished account (Clifford 1990: 51). *Transcription* refers to texts that are effectively less word-to-word textualizations of speech or other communicative acts. This also refers to paradigms gathered through elicitation.

The transcriptions form the largest body of material collected by Castrén, which reflects his linguistically and philologically oriented research task. I have discussed these in relation to the previous folklore notes, which will not be commented upon herein (Lukin 2017). The notes available in the *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar* and in the more fragmented notes fall between inscriptions and descriptions. Timo Salminen notes in his comments on Castrén's Lapland 1838 diary that because of some recurring notes (the first notes shorter than the subsequent ones), it can be inferred that Castrén added details and narration around his jottings, which resulted in travel diaries (Castrén 2019a: 218, Note 1434). In

the *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar* manuscript, we can find sections that represent text that is effectively ready for publication following sections with rough descriptions in a confusing order. Furthermore, the manuscript contains text that represents quoted speech and translations of folklore. As a solid conclusion, it can be said that Castrén used multiple strategies when making and organizing notes and producing knowledge. In addition, he made them publicly available for different kinds of audiences (either during fieldwork or subsequently).

As Clifford notes, the ethnographer fuses his informants with the descriptions to ensure that their viewpoints coalesce and are difficult to separate. It is within the descriptions that the ethnographer speaks for the people they study and uses representational power that is based on selecting, contextualizing and ultimately narrating the other to ensure that it is translated into the language of the ethnographer (Clifford 1990: 62–65). This remark is especially relevant to notes made in diaries and notebooks, where the notes are represented following each other either in random order or structured, as in *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar*. For example, it is extremely difficult to determine who told Castrén about the Christianization of the Nenets or about the island of Vajgač with its sacrificial places and idols. However, it should be clear that the structured form was finalized by Castrén himself. Moreover, some descriptions appear to be based on Castrén's own observations, such as the detailed description about harnessing the reindeer to the sledge structure. Further, there are clear indigenous voices in the notes, both as direct quotations and in details that revolve around customs and habits. As the transcriptions tend to suggest a picture of direct quotes, the inscriptions (and especially the descriptions) are indirect quotations combined with the views and points of the researcher. Again, the researcher is not collecting the material randomly, rather he is constantly choosing things and evaluating them against what he should and should not bring back from the field. This returns us to Sjögren's instructions, which reminded Castrén to collect knowledge about physical build, ways of life, clothing, customs and habits, cultural levels and religious notions.

To demonstrate how keenly Castrén followed Sjögren's instructions and his examples, I have compared *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar* with Sjögren's monograph on the Komi, *Die Syrjänen, ein historisch-statistisch-philologischer Versuch* (1861) in Table 1. *Die Syrjänen* has been referred to as a "landmark in the evolution of Finno-Ugrian

studies" (Branch 1973: 164). Comparing the chapters of the monograph with Castrén's manuscript, we can observe that Castrén united the themes of Sjögren's Chapters I and II into his first chapter. Further, Castrén's second chapter corresponds approximately to Chapter III. In Chapter VI, Sjögren discusses themes similar to Castrén's Chapters 3–6. Further, Castrén's Chapter 7 corresponds to Sjögren's Chapters IV and V. The only part missing is the language, which is related to Castrén preparing both separate grammars and vocabularies for each language he studied and the rich morphologies and other features of the Samoyedic languages. Rather than order and organization, I would like to emphasize the classes of research data, which tend to correspond. The biggest difference between Castrén and Sjögren arises between Castrén's clear interest in mythology and vernacular religion, which was simply one subject among many others for Sjögren.

The comparison in Table 1 shows that Castrén's way of thinking about the items to be collected and how to structure his research data not only follows Sjögren's example, it can also be set within the longer evolving tradition of European *Völkerbeschreibung*. In the still longer traditions of traveling in Europe, the so-called *ars apodemica* included similar kinds of lists of desiderata. As has been pointed out by Stagl (1995: 278–280), the difference between the *ars apodemica* and systematic instructions for ethnographic expeditions lies in the individuals' aims of educating oneself and carrying out a certain task set forth in the instructions, and thus in contingency and systematicity. This systematic nature of collecting in order to take part in an international academic venture ties Castrén's work in the evolving European tradition of ethnography. Additionally, I want to emphasize, firstly, the ever-consistent focus on linguistic groups and, secondly, the way in which these linguistic groups began to be defined through the regions in which they lived. In the process, the linguistic and regional markers started to represent decisive elements in defining and describing ethnic groups. Thirdly, there also seems to be a beginning for a research tradition whereby both material and immaterial items are collected, but the immaterial data – based on language – provide a basis for historical and comparative analysis. The material evidence has since then served the comparative analysis, but it has had a secondary role. (See, e.g., Siikala 2006: 159–160.) Fourthly, and related to my previous point, the research task was emphatically historical and comparative, which is why none of the research materials was considered to be sufficient on their own.

## 5. Ethnological lectures and the definition of ethnography

*Ethnologiska föreläsningar öfver Altaiska folken samt Samojediska och Ta-tariska sagor* (Castrén 1857a) represents the text that Castrén wrote for the series of lectures he read at Imperial Alexander University (Helsinki) in May 1851. This was after he was nominated as the first professor of Finnish. The "*sagor*" representing mythic tales or legends were probably added to the volume in the editorial process because they represented part of what was understood to be ethnology or ethnography at the time. In his introduction to the volume, the editor Carl Gustaf Borg notes that Castrén prepared the lectures extremely quickly and that he definitely did not intend the text to be published (Borg 1857: V–VI). In the lectures, Castrén highlights the communities that he theorized as being of the same origin (and thus race[7]), including their histories, ways of life and traditions. Moreover, the introduction for the lectures defines the premises of ethnography and historical and comparative linguistics, which makes them extremely valuable when evaluating Castrén's methodology. The introduction also appears to address issues that were central to the lectures on Finnish mythology that Castrén read in autumn 1851 and spring 1852 (Castrén 1853; see Ahola and Lukin 2019). After the introduction, Castrén moves from what he understood to be the furthest linguistic (or racial) relatives of the Finns to those closer, ending the lectures by describing the Finns and Finnish tribes. Consequently, the Tungusic peoples, Mongols and Turks are discussed first, after which Castrén describes the Samoyeds, the Yenisei Ostyaks (the Ket and Kot peoples), the Ob-Ugric peoples, Volga and Permic tribes, and finally the Finnic[8] ones. The more written evidence available, the longer Castrén talks about the people in question. The chapters tend to follow a certain model in which the national character, place of origin, history, different subgroups of the people with their population numbers and contemporary living places represent the background knowledge

---

7. As already noted by Mikko Korhonen (1986: 60), Castrén seems to think linguistic and racial affinity are similar things.
8. The terminology of Castrén differs from the modern one. In this article, *Finnar* is translated as Finno-Ugric, *Finska stammen* as Finnic. Finns and Finnish refers to Castrén's *Finnar* in the sense of speakers of Finnish. According to Castrén, Saami is so close to Finnish that they historically represent the same tribe (Castrén 1857a: 151).

presented at the beginning. Next, Castrén proceeds to describe the different linguistic branches in more detail, talking about their livelihoods, customs and manners, cultural level ("civilization", literature), and religion.

The chapter *Samojeder* 'Samoyeds' in the lectures is short and concise. It begins by providing a general overview of the Samoyedic branch of languages, its geographical distribution, and the way of life of the speakers of the Samoyedic languages. Subsequently, Castrén notes that although there is no available historical evidence on the origins of the Samoyeds and craniology has resulted in unreliable and ambiguous results, it should be clear from the linguistic perspective that the Samoyeds and Finno-Ugric tribes belong to the same race. Castrén lists the three larger branches: 1) the Yurak Samoyeds (the contemporary Nenets), 2) the Tawgy Samoyeds (the contemporary Nganasan), and 3) the Ostyak Samoyeds (the contemporary Selkup). He then lists two smaller ones: 4) the Yenisei Samoyeds (contemporary Enets) and 5) the Kamass. He notes that while the Samoyeds in the north own and herd reindeer, the Ostyak Samoyeds are mainly hunters and fishers. Moreover, although the Kamass live in southern Siberia and are hunters, some may own a small number of reindeer. According to Castrén's theory, the Kamass provide a link between the northern Samoyeds and the Altai mountains, which is proven by their southern living areas and some family names that are shared with the northern Samoyeds. Castrén explains that the Samoyed tribes vacated the Altai region after Turkic tribes settled there, which happened before the first written evidence was recorded in the Chronicle of Nestor. Referring to oral tradition, he notes that the Samoyed tribes had contact and confrontations with Finno-Ugric tribes (especially the Ostyaks), who drove the Samoyeds from the lower Ob to the Arctic Ocean coast. They also interacted with the so-called Čuds on the western side of the Ural Mountains. Finally, Castrén analyses some toponymic evidence. For example, he argues that the river name Ischma (Ižma) is equivalent to the Finnish *isomaa* 'large land'. Subsequently, this was called *Bol'šaja Zemlja* in Russian and *Arka ya* in Tundra Nenets, both meaning the same as Finnish *isomaa*.

When comparing the discussed manuscripts with the *Ethnologiska föreläsningar*, one must note that the lecture section on the Samoyeds is extremely concise and moves on a more abstract level than the minutiae of the ethnographic notes in the manuscripts. Nevertheless, the lectures and the *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar* manuscript share the same structure. In particular, the categories are similar. Again,

these refer back to the instructions and practical example of A. J. Sjögren, as discussed previously. Moreover, even the definition of the research aims and ethnography had clear attachments to Sjögren. While this may not be a surprise, I would like to discuss this in relation to the definition of ethnography itself and in relation to Castrén, Sjögren and their predecessors. The definition of ethnography is often cited as follows:

> Detta [ethnografi] är ett nytt namn för en gammal sak. Man förstår dermed vetenskapen om folkslagens religion, samhällsskick, seder och bruk, lefnadssätt, boningar, med ett ord: om allt, som hör till deras inre och yttre lif. Man kunde också betrakta ethnografin såsom en del af kulturhistorien, men icke all nationer ega en historia i högre mening, utan deras historia utgöres just af ethnografin. (Castrén 1857a: 8)

> This [ethnography] is a new name for an old thing. It means research into the religion, society, customs, way of life, dwellings of peoples, in one word: everything belonging to their inner and outer life. Ethnography could be regarded as a part of cultural history, but not all nations have a history in the higher sense, but the very ethnography is their history.

Continuing his reasoning, Castrén notes that because many people do not have written history, their history in the sense of ethnography can be interpreted in their oral traditions. Here, Castrén refers to Finnish runosongs (*våra runor* or 'our runosongs'), expecting researchers to compare conceptions in these with those in the songs of related peoples, "who have still preserved their pure, original character". For Castrén, ethnography is about history, and he lists this subject as one of the ancillary disciplines of history together with philology, or better linguistics. Philology focuses on the textual criticism of old (Greek) texts, whereas linguists can (and should) study multiple languages that can lack a written tradition. Linguistics can also be called comparative philology: it concentrates on languages that are materially related (through phonology, words and word forms) and hence are part of the same language family. The aim of such comparison is to reveal the developmental processes of these languages (Castrén 1857a: 2–7). Comparative ethnography "covers our ancient songs and conceptions on the whole". Together with linguistics, this permits a description of the relationships between the tribes related to the Finns (Castrén 1857a: 11). It should be noted that Castrén did not think that oral traditions would reflect history in the sense of narration as such. Rather, folklore represents a source that enables researchers to reveal comparable

conceptions, allowing them to find the most original one and help to uncover the development of the conception. This follows the example of Sjögren and Müller in seeking the history of peoples with no written history in their language, via oral communication through comparisons.

Hence, ethnography is part of a research scheme with the aim of untangling the structure and history of mankind through comparative methods. It is based on the understanding of structures and is comparable to zoology. Castrén extensively cites August Schleicher, who set zoology and philology in parallel and brought the idea of development that occurs from a pure and original form to one more developed and advanced (and more mingled and unstructured) into philology. Compared to the methods used in disciplines that would subsequently be called physical anthropology, comparative philology and ethnography can provide more precise and reliable results, although their task in revealing the structure and history was the same. Castrén argues this point after introducing linguistics and ethnography.

Further, Castrén criticizes craniology and its methods as uncertain and underdeveloped, although he does not rule out the possibility of its future development. Race as a notion is a valid conception for Castrén, and he appears to use it interchangeably with the notion of people (*folkslag*). However, he does not accept the theses of Retzius, Blumenbach, Heusinger or Bory de Saint-Vincent but denounces them again and again. These trains of thought link Castrén to the general tendencies of thought in the Academy in Saint Petersburg and the Russian Geographical Society. Von Baer followed the so-called monogenist theory according to which human varieties had developed due to differing environmental (economic and cultural) conditions, but unlike his teacher Blumenbach, von Baer preferred to call races "tribes" (*Stamm*). He also criticized craniology before he became acquainted with Retzius's methods. (See, e.g., Tammiksaar & Kalling 2019.) Castrén sets himself the task of uncovering the history of mankind, but he refuses to discuss the varieties in terms of physical traits. He insists on language and linguistic features as decisive elements in deciding the varieties of human societies. Here, he comes close to the discussions within the Russian Geographical Society (Knight 1998: 121–122). Similarly, Castrén's emphasis on mythology can be set in parallel with the so-called mythological school of Fëdor Ivanovič Buslaev (1818–1897), but unlike Buslaev and his colleagues who could work with written Slavic materials, Castrén had to rely on oral texts (Balandin 1988).

Recently, Juha Pentikäinen has argued that Castrén's fieldwork and lectures show him to be the founder of what Pentikäinen calls "northern ethnography", which can also be observed in the work of Antal Réguly (Pentikäinen 1997; 2007[9]). It is undeniable that in the course of his lectures, Castrén was calling for more researchers to work within the languages that he called Altaic. The aim was to enhance the comparative and historical work which had only been practiced thoroughly among the Indo-European languages. Consequently, we can perceive Castrén's task as northern, although the geographical scope of Altaic also implies southern. However, we cannot view Castrén as the founder of ethnography. Quite the contrary, his work should be viewed in the larger European and Russian scholarly contexts described previously. Accordingly, it should be clear that when Castrén refers to ethnography as "a new name for an old thing", he is not claiming to be the first ethnographer. He is simply referring to the task he was commissioned to perform by the Academy and to earlier researchers and travelers of the 18th century. The term was new to Castrén and the Russian Academy of Sciences, as exemplified by Sjögren being nominated as the first chair of ethnography (more precisely of the languages and ethnography of the Finno-Ugric and Caucasian peoples) in the Academy of Sciences (and the world) in 1844 (Laine 2020: 136–137; Vermeulen 2015: 409). The task, that of *Völker-Beschreibung*, was old. It was familiar to Castrén from the Finnish discussions that had strong Schlözerian tones since the work of Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739–1802) and from the discussions in Saint Petersburg.

## 6. Conclusion: Beyond Finland and the North

The aim of this article has been to set Castrén's ethnography (the notes, fieldwork, consequent travel narratives, and lectures) in its disciplinary and historical context. In doing so, it has been necessary to widen the scope of discussion from Finnish and northern contexts to encompass also Imperial Russian and European ones. In addition to Pentikäinen's aim of placing Castrén on a separate pedestal of northern ethnography "half a century before Franz Boas" (Pentikäinen 2007: 195), there has been a tendency to emphasize Castrén's significance for Finnish humanities

---

9.   Similar remarks can also be found in Pentikäinen (2001).

and Finno-Ugrian studies (e.g. Salminen 2019b: 21). Branch noted that Sjögren's name was forgotten (or marginalized) in this process as one of the important links between Castrén and Sjögren's predecessors (Branch 1973: 256–257, 261–262). Recently, Päivi Laine has attempted to balance this picture, noting that Sjögren's name and scholarly work have also been appreciated (Laine 2020: 124–125, 221–222). Following Branch and Laine, I have sought balance and I wanted to "escape altogether from the notion of 'founders'" (Branch 1973: 262) and from revolving around centers and margins. In other words, I have positioned Sjögren and Castrén in the continuum of the development of ethnography in the Imperial Russian and European setting, which is wider than the northern dimension or the finnocentric disputes over national heroes. Succinctly, Castrén's fieldnotes and ethnologic lectures constitute less than the foundation of ethnography and more than Finnish research history.

In setting Castrén in the international academic context, it is important to focus on the fundamental relationship between Castrén and Sjögren and the fact that Sjögren asked Castrén to conduct fieldwork, he drew up instructions, gave Castrén advice, and promoted Castrén's future career in Saint Petersburg. At that time, Sjögren was an academician in Saint Petersburg and had been working for years conducting fieldwork and developing his methodology. Castrén's research methodology tends to follow Sjögren's "triple methodology" (Branch 1973), focusing on linguistic and ethnographic evidence and detailed archival work (where possible).

Sjögren's methodology was original, but it did not develop on its own. The type of ethnographic and linguistic methodology developed by Sjögren and followed by Castrén could not have emerged without the earlier contacts between German scholars and the Russian tsars and the consequent research expeditions in Siberia. As the same methodology developed in several European countries into ethnology and folklore studies (focused more on national peasant cultures than on the colonial others), a division developed within the practice of ethnography in Russia. Consequently, the manuscript *Ethnographiska, Historiska och Statistiska anmärkningar* together with the scattered ethnographic notes in Castrén's manuscript collections should be viewed within this context, where the history of humanity met with the nationalist interests of Russia and the Grand Duchy of Finland. For Castrén, the pertinent questions were about the Finns (and their history) and the global task of revealing the history of humanity. These tasks were not in conflict, but rather they represented

together a fruitful arena where the history and peculiar nature of the Finns could be described at the same time as the larger context of all humanity.

The international scope of Castrén's ethnography and its relation to Sjögren's program has been highlighted in this article by comparing the structure and content of different kinds of instructions, which included detailed lists on what to collect as well as notes about how to find informants. The lists show the continuity of Müllerian *Völker-Beschreibung*, which emphasized linguistic and geographical criteria in categorizing communities, on the one hand, and the collection of material evidence for the categories, on the other. Notes were an essential part of the Müllerian fieldwork tradition: they formed the evidence from which the comparisons could be made. Although the fieldnotes tend to create a sense of objective data obtained from the people in which Castrén was interested, the research results and audiences reveal that Castrén was working to create a history for the Finns. The details that Castrén noted down also resonate with the Müllerian traditions.

In ethnography, Castrén sought features that, on the one hand, represented peculiarities that set the people in question apart, and on the other hand, details that could be compared to those corresponding to other peoples. These features were often material ones, such as clothing, dwellings or reindeer harnesses. However, other features could only be known through speech and practices alone, such as religion and manners or national characteristics. What is more, the peoples were categorized linguistically, which is why all the other features found their place under the linguistic communities. Consequently, in addition to these lists of *desiderata* to be collected, there were already clear categories to which they belonged, facilitating comparisons between human groups. When Castrén selected details and recorded them in his notes, they did not always find their place in the categories created prior to the encounter with the Samoyed peoples. However, there are astonishingly few details that did not find their place in the ethnological or mythological lectures or travelogues. In these processes, the details of the everyday life of the Samoyeds fell into the larger picture and narratives, which might have very different meanings compared to the informants.

## References

Ahola, Joonas & Lukin, Karina. 2019. Castrén's lectures on Finnish mythology: Methodological reflections. *RMN Newsletter* 14. 51–70. https://www2.helsinki.fi/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rmn_14_methodologies.pdf#page=51 (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. Theory in anthropology: Center and periphery. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28. 356–362.

Balandin, Arkadij Ivanovič. 1988. *Mifologičeskaja škola v russkoj fol'kloristike*. Moskva: Nauka.

Bassin, Mark. 2009. *Imperial visions: Nationalist imagination and geographical expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840–1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, Carl Gustaf. 1857. Förord. In Castrén, M. A., *Ethnologiska föreläsningar samt Samojediska och Tatariska sagor*, V–X. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-Sällskapet.

Branch, Michael. 1968. M. A. Castrénin Siperian matkojen alkuvaiheista. *Virittäjä* 72. 336–348.

Branch, Michael. 1973. *A. J. Sjögren: Studies from the North*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Bucher, Gudrun. 2009. The development of research practices during the eighteenth century and their impact on the study of the non-Russian peoples of Siberia in the nineteenth century. In Branch, Michael (ed.), *Defining self: Essays on emergent identities in Russia seventeenth to nineteenth centuries*, 47–58. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Campbell, Lyle. 2002. The history of linguistics. In Aronoff, Mark & Rees-Miller, Janie (eds.), *The handbook of linguistics*, 81–104. Oxford & Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Castrén, M. A. 1852. *M. A. Castréns reseminnen från åren 1838–1844*. Nordiska resor och forskningar I. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-Sällskapet.

Castrén, M. A. 1853. *M. A. Castréns föreläsningar i finsk mytologi*. Nordiska resor och forskningar III. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-Sällskapet.

Castrén, M. A. 1855. *M. A. Castréns reseberättelser och bref åren 1845–1849*. Nordiska resor och forskningar II. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-Sällskapet.

Castrén, M. A. 1857a. *Ethnologiska föreläsningar öfver altaiska folken samt Samojediska och Tatariska sagor*. Nordiska resor och forskningar IV. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-Sällskapet.

Castrén, M. A. 1857b. *Ethnologische Vorlesungen über die altaischen Völker nebst samojedischen Märchen und tatarischen Heldensagen*. Ed. Anton Schiefner. Nordische Reisen und Forschungen von Dr. M. Alexander Castrén IV. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Castrén, M. A. 2019a. *Itineraria 1*. Ed. Timo Salminen. Manuscripta Castreniana, Personalia II, 1. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Castrén, M. A. 2019b. *Itineraria 2*. Ed. Timo Salminen. Manuscripta Castreniana, Personalia II, 2. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Castrén, M. A. 2021. *Epistulae 1*. Ed. Timo Salminen. Manuscripta Castreniana, Personalia I, 1. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Clifford, James. 1990. Notes on (field)notes. In Sanjek, Roger (ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology*, 47–70. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Forsyth, James. 1992. *A history of the peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian colony, 1581–1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, Catherine. 2022. *Geographies of nationhood: Cartography, science, and society in the Russian Imperial Baltic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grünthal, Riho. 2010. Matkueita tai yksityisiä tutkijoita: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran keruuretkien tausta ja tavoitteet. In Kokkonen, Paula & Kurvinen, Anna (eds.), *Kenttäretkistä tutkimustiedoksi*, 17–57. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Jackson, Jane. 1990. "I am a fieldnote": Fieldnotes as a symbol of professional identity. In Sanjek, Roger (ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology*, 3–33. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

KK Coll 593.5.6. Ostjaker vid Irtisch. *Manuscripta Castreniana*. National Library of Finland.

KK Coll. 593.5.7. Ostjaker wid nedra Ob. *Manuscripta Castreniana*. National Library of Finland.

KK Coll. 593.13.1. Ethnographiska, historiska och statistiska anmärkningar. *Manuscripta Castreniana*. National Library of Finland.

Klaproth, Julius. 1823. *Asia polyglotta*. Paris: Schubart.

Knight, Nathaniel. 1998. Science, empire, and nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855. In Burbank, Jane & Ransel, David L. (eds.), *Imperial Russia: New histories for the empire*, 108–141. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Knight, Nathaniel. 2009. Seeking the self in the other: Ethnographic studies of non-Russians in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1860. In Branch, Michael (ed.), *Defining self: Essays on emergent identities in Russia seventeenth to nineteenth centuries*, 117–138. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1986. *Finno-Ugrian language studies in Finland 1828–1918*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Laine, Päivi. 2020. *Suutarinpojasta Venäjän tiedeakatemian akateemikoksi: A.J. Sjögrenin ura Pietarissa 1820-1855*. Tampere: Yliopistopaino. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-1567-2 (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

Lukin, Karina. 2017. Matthias Alexander Castrén's notes on Nenets folklore. *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 96. 169–211. https://doi.org/10.33340/susa.70257 (Accessed 2022-07-19)

Lukin, Karina. Forthcoming. 'More inclined to pity than love': M.A. Castrén's published letters about the Nenets. In Pöysä, Jyrki & Kurvet-Käosaar, Leena (eds.), *Letters and emotions*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Pallas, Peter Simon. 1771–1776. *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Rußischen Reichs*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserl. Academie der Wissenschaften. https://gdz.sub.uni-goettingen.de/volumes/id/PPN32991345X (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

PENTIKÄINEN, JUHA. 1997. Castrénilainen 'pohjoisen etnografian' paradigma. In Viljanen, Anna Maria & Lahti, Minna (eds.), *Kaukaa haettua: Kirjoituksia antropologisesta kenttätyöstä*, 224–236. Helsinki: Suomen antropologinen seura.

PENTIKÄINEN, JUHA. 2001. Northern Ethnography – On the foundations of a new paradigm. *Los Desafíos de la Antropología: Sociedad Moderna, Globalización y Diferencia. Cuarto Congreso Chileno Antropología 19 al 23 de noviembre 2001*. Campus Juan Gómez Millas de la Universidad de Chile. https://web. archive.org/web/20051227182523/http://rehue.csociales.uchile.cl/antropologia/ congreso/c05.html (Accessed 2022-07-19.)

PENTIKÄINEN, JUHA. 2007. Northern ethnography, on the foundations of a new paradigm. In Roselli, Maria Gloria & Piludu, Vesa Matteo (eds.), *Orsi e sciamani = Bears and shamans*, 191–196. Firenze: Edifir.

SALMINEN, TIMO. 2019a. Editor's foreword. In Castrén, M. A., *Itineraria 1*, 11–12. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

SALMINEN, TIMO. 2019b. Matthias Alexander Castrén as a travelling researcher. In Castrén, M. A., *Itineraria 1*, 18–54. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

SALMINEN, TIMO. 2019c. M. A. Castrén's travel routes. In Castrén, M. A., *Itineraria 1*, 55–69. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

SANJEK, ROGER. 1990. A vocabulary of fieldnotes. In Sanjek, Roger (ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology*, 92–138. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

SIIKALA, ANNA-LEENA & ULYASHEV, OLEG. 2011. *Hidden rituals and public performances: Traditions and belonging among the post-Soviet Khanty, Komi and Udmurts*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. https://doi.org/10.21435/sff.19 (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

SIIKALA, JUKKA. 2006. The ethnography of Finland. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35. 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123206 (Accessed 2022-07-07.)

SJÖGREN, ANDREJ MIHAJLOVIČ. 1844. Instruction générale donnée à M. Castrén, voyageur chargé par l'Académie de l'exploration de la Sibérie septentrionale et centrale sous le rapport de l'ethnographie et de la linguistique, par M. Sjoegren (Lu le 12 janvier 1844). *Bulletin de la Classe des Sciences historiques, philologiques et politiques de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg* I(20–21). 326–332.

SJÖGREN, ANDERS JOHAN. 1854. Teckning af M. A. Castréns lefnad och verksamhet. *Suomi* 14. 237–283.

SJÖGREN, ANDERS JOHAN. 1861. *Historisch-ethnographische Abhandlungen über den finnisch-russischen Norden*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

STAGL, JUSTIN. 1995. *A history of curiosity: The theory of travel, 1550–1800*. Australia: Harwood Academic Publishers.

STEPANOV, ALEKSANDR PETROVIČ. 1835. *Enisejskaja gubernija*. Sankt Peterburg: Tipografija Konrada Vingebera.

Stipa, Günter. 1990. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neupositivismus*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Suxova, Natal'ja Georgievna. 1993. Pëtr Ivanovič Këppen kak geograf (k 200-letiju so dnja roždenija). *Izvestija Russkogo geografičeskogo obščestva* 125(5). 1–11.

Suxova, Natal'ja Georgievna. 2020. Russkoe geografičeskoe obščestvo i poljarnye issledovanija v XIX stoletija. In Filin, P. & Emelina, N. (eds.), *Poljarnye čtenija*, 523–541. Moskva: Paulsen.

Tammiksaar, Erki. 2002a. Karl Ernst von Baer as an anthropologist. *Papers on Anthropology* XI. 313–323.

Tammiksaar, Erki. 2002b. Contributions of K. E. von Baer to the investigation of the physical geography of the Arctic in the 1830–40s. *Polar Record* 38(205). 121–140.

Tammiksaar, Erki. 2009. The contribution of Karl Ernst von Baer to the study of ethnic minorities in the Russian empire, 1819–1878: A case study. In Branch, Michael (ed.), *Defining self: Essays on emergent identities in Russia seventeenth to nineteenth centuries*, 139–151. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Tammiksaar, Erki & Kalling, Ken. 2019. K. E. von Baer and the development of physical anthropology in Europe. *Centaurus* 60. 270–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/1600-0498.12189 (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

Tammiksaar, Erki & Stone, Ian R. 2007. Alexander von Middedorf and his expedition to Siberia (1842–1845). *Polar Record* 43(226). 193–216. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247407006407 (Accessed 2022-07-08.)

Thornton, Robert. 1983. Narrative ethnography in Africa, 1850–1920. *Man* 18. 502–520.

Vermeulen, Han. 2015. *Before Boas: The genesis of ethnography and ethnology in the German Enlightenment*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

von Köppen, Peter. 1844. Instruction supplémentaire donnée à M. Castrén, par Koppen (Lu le 15 mars 1844). *Bulletin de la Classe des Sciences historiques, philologiques et politiques de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg* I(24). 373–384.

*Mari Saraheimo*
University of Helsinki

# The finite remote past tenses in Udmurt: From temporal to modal and pragmatic functions

In addition to synthetic past tenses, there are several analytic past tenses in the Udmurt language. The analytic remote past tenses have been scarcely studied and they are inconsistently described in previous studies, grammars and textbooks. The present contribution aims to describe the functions of two finite remote past tenses in Udmurt. The data used in the study are newspaper texts, and the analysis has been conducted with the help of native speakers. I have analyzed two sets of forms: the first representing the finite remote past and the second the finite remote past. The results show that Serebrennikov's (1960) description of the analytic remote pasts is in many ways accurate, and that contrary to what many newer descriptions suggest, the forms in question do not differ in aspectual notions. The forms have the temporal properties of general remote pasts. Nonetheless, the remote past constructions in Udmurt do not only operate on a temporal level but also bear modal and pragmatic functions. Both forms have a future counterfactual function, which is used to express an unfulfilled action or intention. Both forms may also be pragmatically motivated: the first remote past may be used to mark information as shared knowledge and it may alter the tone of the utterance, whereas the second remote past may imply a combination of evidential, inferential and mirative notions.

## 1. Introduction

In addition to synthetic past tenses, many Uralic languages use analytic forms to refer to past events. Analytic past tenses consisting of an auxiliary and a finite form of the lexical verb are typical for the Uralic languages spoken in the Volga region, such as Mari and Udmurt, and similar forms are found in the Turkic languages spoken in the area (Honti 2000; Bradley et al. 2022). Although the tense systems of these languages are particularly rich in form and function, the analytic forms have not received much attention in earlier studies. The aim of this article is to introduce the temporal, modal and pragmatic functions of the finite remote past tenses of Udmurt.

Udmurt belongs to the Permian branch of the Uralic language family. As a highly agglutinative and morphologically rich language with a dominantly head-final word order, Udmurt represents features very typical of the Uralic languages (Edygarova 2022). Udmurt has undergone significant influence from the neighboring Turkic languages Tatar, Chuvash and Bashkir. In addition to the Turkic languages, a major influence is Russian (Bartens 2000; for more details, see Edygarova 2022). In Udmurt, the past tense system consists of two synthetic past tenses, the witnessed or neutral first past and the evidential second past, and a variety of analytic forms. Most studies on the Udmurt tense system have focused on the two synthetic past tenses (Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022). The analytic past tenses are formed by combining finite and non-finite verb forms with the past copula. Some of the analytic past forms are remote past tenses, which resemble pluperfects in Standard Average European (SAE) (cf. Dahl 1985: 144–149). The analytic past tenses of Udmurt, including the remote past, have scarcely been studied and are only briefly presented in the existing grammars and textbooks. The remote past forms are relatively marginal and infrequent, yet they are regularly encountered in texts and grammars and they offer intriguing insights into the typology of remote pasts.

Serebrennikov (1960: 121–125) describes the analytic remote pasts in Udmurt as having a wide range of functions. In addition to marking an action as preceding another action in the context, the remote pasts are used to mark actions and events interrupted by a following event, as well as in anaphorically referring to something that has been said or discussed earlier. In her article on the remote past forms, Zaguljaeva (1984) states that the forms express distant past events which take place and end before

another event. Zaguljaeva also claims that the forms may express an action "contradicting" another action or event. While she gives some examples, she does not elaborate further on the topic.

The recent western Udmurt grammars have a different take on describing the functions of the finite remote past forms. Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen (2008: 268–269) refer to the forms as pluperfects, and claim that they express an action or event, taking place before the moment of speech or possibly in a remoter past, happening before another action or event in synthetic past (first past or second past). Although Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen do not use aspectual terminology to describe the forms, their description seems to suggest the difference between the two forms to be of aspectual nature: the first remote past would pay attention to the process (1), while the second remote past would be used to denote the result of the action (2).

(1)     Со толон тонэ **утчаз вал** но, öз шедьты.

    *So    tolon    ton-e    utča-z         val      no,*
    s/he  yesterday  you-ACC  search-PST1.3SG  be.PST1  but

    *ę-z         šedʹti̮.*
    NEG.PST1-3  find.CNG
    'He was looking for you yesterday but did not find [you].' (Kelʹmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 269)

(2)     Кылем арняе соос доры эшъёссы **лыктӥллям вылэм**.

    *Ki̮lʹem  arńa-je  soos  dor-i̮    eš-jos-si̮*
    last    week-ILL  they  home-ILL  friend-PL-POSS.3PL

    *li̮kt-ilʹlʹam    vi̮lem.*
    come-PST2.3PL  be.PST2
    'Last week, their friends came to visit them [according to them]' (Kelʹmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 269)

While the descriptions do not include words such as aspect, imperfective or perfective, the description as such suggests that the first remote past conveys an imperfective meaning, whereas the second past would be used as a perfective form. A similar explanation is offered by Winkler (2011: 99–100), who refers to Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen's textbook in his grammar, and Kozmács (2002). In the examples which Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen (2008: 269) provide, it is apparent that the chosen example of the first remote past (1) denotes an action or event not ending in results, or

somehow contradicting the following events, which Serebrennikov (1960) and Zaguljaeva (1984) had previously described as characteristic of the Udmurt remote pasts. A contradictive use, however, is not exclusively typical of the first remote past: according to Serebrennikov (1960: 122–123), the second remote past may convey similar meanings as well.

As there is no consistent nor exhaustive description of the Udmurt remote past forms, this article aims to give a deeper insight to the functions of the remote past and the contexts in which different functions and motivations may arise. I call these forms remote pasts, as their semantic profile only partially fits that of typical pluperfects – in Udmurt, there is no unambiguous category of perfect, although the second past carries some typical semantic features of perfects (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000). The functions which are to be given closer scrutiny in the analysis of the data are (i) the temporal function, (ii) the future counterfactual function, referred to as contradictive or discontinued function in previous literature, and other categories connected with future counterfactuality, such as frustrated mental states, (iii) discourse-anaphoric function and (iv) evidential and mirative functions. On a larger scale, the paper contributes to tracing the typology of remote past functions and semantics.

The results of the study show that the functions of the two forms do not differ in aspect, rather they differ in the notion of knowledge management. Both forms are used to express future counterfactuality, although the first remote past seems more prone to future counterfactual use. Both remote pasts may also be used to refer to something that has been earlier discussed by the discourse participants. Connected with future counterfactuality, or possibly also rising from the context of having been discussed before, the first remote past may also convey frustrative meanings. The second remote past, on the other hand, may have a mirative or a counterexpectational meaning.

The structure of the article is as follows: in Section 2 I present the materials and methods used for the study. In Section 3, I present the tense system of Udmurt, with special attention paid to previous descriptions and studies on past tense. In Section 4, I present the main theoretical framework of the study, reflecting on how the Udmurt remote past relates to different categories intertwined with temporality. In Section 5 I present the analysis of the two forms in question. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2. Data and research

The study is a synchronic linguistic analysis on the function of the forms in question. Newspaper texts form the most significant part of the data used for the study. I have used the corpus database Udmurt Corpora provided by Timofey Arkhangelskiy and Maria Medvedeva at the School of Linguistics of HSE (http://udmurt.web-corpora.net). This database consists of a corpus of contemporary written literary Udmurt, a corpus of Udmurt-language social media and a sound-aligned corpus of Udmurt dialects. The corpus of contemporary written literary Udmurt is the main corpus of the database, and I have specifically used the subcorpus of *Udmurt duńńe*, the most popular and well-known Udmurt-language newspaper. I chose to examine newspapers from the years 2013 and 2014 (633,672 tokens), with the exception of the negative second remote past forms, as the subcorpus search yielded no results for them; I ran the search for the negative second past forms across the whole subcorpus of *Udmurt duńńe* (2007–2017, 6,364,820 tokens). I searched the subcorpus for both finite synthetic past forms combined with the past auxiliary *val/vilem*. For this article, altogether 122 instances[1] of remote pasts have been analyzed, of which 86 represent the first remote past and 36 represent the second remote past. The analysis is conducted by examining the forms in their context, paying special attention to other tense forms, elements of future counterfactuality, discourse-pragmatic use in interviews and questions as well as evidential and mirative meanings. Cyrillic (Russian) language data is transcribed according to the International Scholarly System, while the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet (UPA) is used for transcribing Udmurt.

I have complemented the research by consulting two native speakers, Svetlana Edygarova and Lukeriya Shikhova. All the main observations have originally been made by the author; the native speakers have provided me with some further reasoning for choosing a remote past instead of a non-remote past in certain contexts and confirmed my observations to be correct and justified. Both native speakers produced some additional examples to help clarify the difference between certain forms and they gave me advice on which factors could affect the choice of the form. In my analysis, I have marked the source of the produced examples accordingly.

---

1.  This includes all the forms found in the data.

The articles in *Udmurt duńńe* deal with political, societal, economic and cultural issues of the Udmurt Republic. The newspaper represents the standard language, although the journalists are nowadays encouraged not to avoid dialectal expressions and forms. As the grammatical phenomenon in question has not yet been adequately described, I have chosen to focus the study on the representation of these forms in standard language. It should be noted that while the materials in question represent newspaper texts, with only a few exceptions,[2] all of the occurrences are found in interviews and stories people tell about their or someone else's lives. It is important to note the genre of the texts, as the forms are remarkably rare[3] in the corpus, and this observation supports the results of the study concerning the future counterfactual, frustrative and pragmatic functions of the finite remote past forms, as the forms are mostly used in contexts of discourse and (inter)subjective positioning.

## 3. Past tense in Udmurt

Udmurt uses two synthetic past tenses. The first past is often described as the default past tense, whereas the second past is its evidential pair, a form of unwitnessed or reported action. (Bartens 2000: 207–208; Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000; Siegl 2004.) The forms of first past and second past are presented in Tables 1a and 1b below.

Evidentiality in Udmurt has been discussed in various previous studies (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000; Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022). The Udmurt second past expresses non-eyewitness and indirect evidence, including hearsay and inference, but also mirativity and sometimes a lower degree of commitment (Kubitsch 2022). Siegl (2004: 12) sees the first past predominantly as a general or evidentially neutral past instead of a definitively "witnessed" past. Nevertheless, as Kubitsch (2022) points out, when in contrast with the the second past, it could be associated with direct experience, firsthand information or accurate knowledge. Evidentiality is considered a category separate from mood and modality, but evidential markers may develop secondary meanings connected with e.g. the reliability and

2. In the first remote past sample, only one occurrence was found in a news article; in the second remote past, the corresponding number was two.
3. In comparison, a search for the synthetic first past forms in the subcorpus yielded over 40,000 results.

Table 1a: The first past          Table 1b: The second past[a]

|      | Positive | Negative |      | Positive | Negative |
|------|----------|----------|------|----------|----------|
| 1SG | *mịnị* | *ẹ-j mịnị* | 1SG | *mịn-iśkem* | *mịn-iśkymte-je* |
| 2SG | *mịn-i-d* | *ẹ-d mịnị* | 2SG | *mịn-em(-ed)* | *mịnị-mte-jed* |
| 3SG | *mịn-i-z* | *ẹ-z mịnị* | 3SG | *mịn-em* | *mịnị-mte* |
| 1PL | *mịn-i-m(ị)* | *ẹ-m mịn-e* | 1PL | *mịn-iśkem(mị)* | *mịn-iśkịmte-mị* |
| 2PL | *mịn-i-dị* | *ẹ-d mịn-e* | 2PL | *mịn-ilʼlʼam(dị)* | *mịn-ilʼlʼamte-dị* |
| 3PL | *mịn-i-zị* | *ẹ-z mịn-e* | 3PL | *mịn-ilʼlʼam(zị)* | *mịn-ilʼlʼamte* |

a.  I have only included the Southern negation type here, although a Northern variant, composed with the negative existential *ẹvẹl* and the main verb in the positive second past inflection, also exists. However, none of the examples in the article contain occurrences of the Northern variant, and all the negative second remote past occurrences are based on the Southern variant.

probability of the information, which resemble modal meanings (Aikhenvald 2004: 6–7). Givón (2001: 326) states that there is an implicit connection between evidentiality and epistemic modality. According to Kubitsch (2022), the difference between the first and the second past can be related to the accuracy or reliability[4] of the information, and the second past may also be connected to a lower degree of commitment.

The prototypical use of the first past and the second past is demonstrated below in (3a) and (3b).

(3) a.  Коля толон **лыктйз**.

   *Kolʼa    tolon       lịkt-i-z.*
   Kolja   yesterday   come-PST1-3SG
   'Kolja came yesterday.' (Kelʼmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 200)

   b.  Коля толон **лыктэм**.

   *Kolʼa    tolon       lịkt-em.*
   Kolja   yesterday   come-PST2.3SG
   'Kolja came yesterday [apparently].' (Kelʼmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 200)

4.  Leinonen and Vilkuna (2000: 498) also mention the matter of reliability in their study. However, they point out that the reliability of the source is not the real issue but rather whether the speaker takes responsibility for what they said.

Hearsay is the best-known and most often mentioned meaning of the Udmurt second past. Inference is the case when the speaker has not witnessed the action themselves but infer it based on visible or tangible evidence or results (Aikhenvald 2015). The mirative meaning can be described as an unprepared mind or new information that the speaker evaluates as surprising (DeLancey 1997). Mirativity should be considered a distinct semantic and grammatical category, though it is often shown to be linked with evidentiality (DeLancey 1997; Aikhenvald 2004: 195; Peterson 2010; see also Aikhenvald 2012). Mirative meaning is also connected to mental distancing: temporal distance encoded by the evidentials could be associated with mental distance (Kubitsch 2019). The mirative use of the Udmurt second past is shown in (4), where the speaker finds herself covered in thistles and is surprised at this.

(4)    Тйни ук копак люгы **лякиськем** бордам!

*Tińi    uk    kopak    l'ugi    l'akiś-em    bord-am!*
here    PTCL    all    thistle    stick-PST2.3SG    side-INE.1SG
'Look, thistles all stuck to me!' (Kubitsch 2022: 274)

Kubitsch (2022: 273–275) points out that in Udmurt, the second past functions as a mirative strategy rather than a mirative marker, as it is not primarily a mirative marker but can be interpreted as mirative via context: mirativity in the second past is always implied. The only exception is the second past form of the verb 'be' (*vįlem*) which can refer to events or states effective in the present, and may in some contexts be considered a mirative marker.

Udmurt lacks an unambiguous category of perfect. Udmurt has three different past forms or constructions with perfect-like functions, but none of them entirely fits the category of a perfect (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 495–512). The typical functions of a perfect are divided between three forms: the evidential second past described above, the experiential and the resultative participle. The two latter forms may also combine with a past copula, and thus form remote past forms with functions similar to SAE pluperfects (cf. Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 511; Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 2008: 235, 237; see also Nasibullin 1984). As these forms are based on non-finites, they are outside the scope of this study and shall be studied in more detail in future studies.

The descriptions of the Udmurt remote past forms vary both regarding their form and function. Most studies, grammars and textbooks refer to them as pluperfects that, by and large, correlate in function with western pluperfects (cf. Serebrennikov 1960; Kozmács 2002; Kel′makov & Hännikäinen 2008; Winkler 2011), while some publications refer to them as remote analytic pasts (Zaguljaeva 1984). Different studies give different paradigms to the remote past constructions, as presented below in Tables 2 and 3. The forms taken into consideration in this study are the finite variants, as shown in Examples (1) and (2) in Section 1, and they are set in bold in Table 3.

Table 2: Earlier descriptions of Udmurt remote pasts

|  | 1st remote past | 2nd remote past |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Serebrennikov 1960 | *-Vm*(POSS) + *val* / PST2 + *vịlem* | PST1 + *val* |
| Zaguljaeva 1984 | *-Vm*(POSS) / PST2 + *val* | PST1 + *val* |

Table 3: Descriptions of the Udmurt remote pasts in modern grammars and textbooks

|  | 1st remote past | 2nd remote past |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kel′makov & Hännikäinen 2008 | **PST1 + *val*** | *-Vm*(POSS) + *val* / PST2 + *vịlem* |
| Winkler 2011 | **PST1 + *val*** | *-Vm*(POSS) / PST2 + *val* |
| Kozmács 2002 | **PST1 + *val*** | **PST2 + *val*** / *vịlem* |
| Tarakanov 2011 | **PST1 + *val*** | *-Vm*(POSS) + *val* / PST2 + *vịlem* |

In addition to the above-mentioned works (Tables 2 and 3), Bartens (2000: 208–210) mentions the forms and explains that they express "a remoter past". Leinonen and Vilkuna (2000: 511) briefly review the remote past forms in their study on the Permian past tense and conclude that the Udmurt analytic remote past tense forms "signal a break in the narrative sequence", which concurs with how Serebrennikov (1960: 121–124) and Zaguljaeva (1984) describe the form to express an action that was interrupted, led to no results or contradicts the following. Serebrennikov (1960: 125) also claims that the first remote past is used to refer to earlier discussions. This function is not mentioned in the later grammars and studies written on the subject. In the later western grammars and textbooks (Kozmács 2002; Kel′makov & Hännikäinen 2008; Winkler 2011) the functions of the

remote past forms are described as differentiated based on whether it is the process or the result which is given attention. The problem with this explanation for the functions of the remote past constructions is that it leaves the reader under the impression that the two forms differ in aspectual nature, but when one studies the forms more closely, it is apparent that both respective forms may denote a perfective or an imperfective action, which I will show later in the analysis in Section 5.1.

As this article concerns only the finite forms, the non-finite second remote past in Tables 2 and 3 (-*Vm*(POSS) + *val*) is not taken into consideration in this study. Some studies (Kozmács 2002, Winkler 2011) do mention the possibility of combining the finite second past and a first past auxiliary *val*, and it remains unclear whether this form would be evidential or non-evidential. I ran a search in the Udmurt corpus (whole corpus search, as a search in the subcorpus defined in Section 2 did not yield any results) for second past forms combining with a non-evidential auxiliary *val*, and it seems that these types of forms occur only rarely, mostly found in an Udmurt-language newspaper published in Tatarstan. This would suggest that this form is an areally used variant for either the first or the second remote past. As this article concerns itself only with the finite forms in standard literary Udmurt, these forms will not be taken into consideration in this study.

In his recent study of the Udmurt analytic forms focusing on aspectual differences between different combinations of *val* and *vịlem* the analytic past tenses,[5] Németh (2019) consulted a group of six native speakers on the choice of the form of the auxiliary with the said forms. According to Németh, all the informants would also accept a combination of the first past and the second past auxiliary *vịlem*. In my data, this combination is nonexistent, which may be due to the said combination being understood as non-standard or unsuitable for the literary language, as it is also lacking from the descriptions of Udmurt grammar. Nevertheless, the question of the morphological variation of the form in spoken variants of Udmurt remains a topic outside the scope of this study. Németh also takes

---

5. In addition to the remote past tenses, Udmurt uses a durative analytic past (PRS + *val*/*vịlem*) and a habitual analytic past (FUT + *val*/*vịlem*). As these forms temporally operate on a non-remote level and are thus outside the scope of this article, I instruct the reader to turn to Winkler (2011: 98–99) for further information on the use of the said analytic forms.

aspectuality into consideration in his study, and the results of this study mostly align with his observations, as discussed further in Section 5.1.

In addition to remote past forms, *val* and *vị̆lem* participate in attenuating the tone in modal constructions (Kubitsch 2020, 2021). According to Kubitsch, *val* and *vị̆lem* attenuate the tone of commands in the imperative mood as well as in other deontic modal constructions (*lị̆ktị̆* 'come!', *lị̆ktị̆ val* 'come, please!', Kubitsch 2020: 107). Kubitsch (2021) concludes that when *val/vị̆lem* is combined with moods or in modal constructions, it may be either temporally or modally motivated: it might indicate that the action took place in the past, but depending on the context, it may be interpreted as a modal particle with no past reference.

## 4. Typology of the remote past tenses

As the forms in question have been called pluperfects in earlier works and studies, and the category of pluperfect is perhaps the best-known remote past category in linguistics, it is appropriate to take a closer look here at the definitions and differences between the categories of a pluperfect and a remote past. In SAE languages, remote past mostly manifests through a tense called the pluperfect, which falls under the said category of a remoter past (Dahl 1985: 144–149). Comrie (1985: 65) describes the pluperfect as a tense with a reference point in the past, expressing an action or an event located prior to that reference point: it could be described as a "past in the past". Dahl (1985: 144) sees the category mostly as a combination of two categories – past and perfect – although he admits that this view is somewhat problematic, as some languages do possess the category of a pluperfect but lack an unambiguous category of a perfect. As Udmurt represents a language that lacks the said category, and typical pluperfects are deictically dependent on other past reference times, I have chosen to address the forms in question as remote pasts, not pluperfects. The name pluperfect unnecessarily leads the reader to assume a perfect reading for the main verb, and thereby relying on such a term hinders a comprehensive understanding of the forms.

In his study, Reichenbach (1947: 297) describes the relations between different tenses in English formally as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Reichenbach's formal presentation of past tenses in English. Key: E = event time, R = reference time, S = speech time

| Structure | Name |
|-----------|------|
| E – R – S | Past perfect (pluperfect) |
| E, R – S | Simple past |
| E – S, R | Present perfect |

In Table 4, E stands for event time (the time the referred event or action takes place), R for reference time (the time of the main storyline) and S for speech time (the time when the utterance is spoken). In the simple past, the event time and reference time are simultaneous, but they precede the speech time. In the present perfect, the speech time and the reference time are simultaneous, but the event time precedes them. In the pluperfect, the event time precedes the reference time, which in turn precedes the speech time. Reichenbach's study serves as a base for describing tense forms in many languages and linguistic works, and it will serve as a tool for describing the temporal profile of the Udmurt remote past.

Temporally, Reichenbach's description often fits the use of the Udmurt remote past forms, as in (5), where the reference time is given in the (mirative) second past (*potil'l'am*) (R), and the action in the second remote past marks an even earlier event (E), which is relevant at the reference time (E – R – S).

(5)    Валлы бертылыкуз, гондырез кутэмми сярысь кинлы-солы **верам вылэм**. Гуртэ вуим но […] гондыр ваеммес учкыны пичиен бадӟымен потӥллям.

*Val-lị        bertịlị-ku-z,         gondịr-ez   kut-em-mị*
horse-DAT return-CVB-POSS.3SG bear-ACC   catch-NMLZ-1PL

*śarịś   kin-lị-so-lị          vera-m        vịlem.   Gurt-e*
about  who-DAT-he-DAT  say-PST2.3SG be.PST2 village-ILL

*vu-i-m            no, […] gondịr  vaj-em-mes*
come-PST1-1PL  and        bear     bring-NMLZ-POSS.1PL.ACC

*ućk-ịnị       pići-jen      badźim-en   pot-il'l'am.*
watch-INF  small-INS  big-INS        come.out-PST2.3PL

'As he returned to the horse, he had [apparently] told someone we had caught a bear. We arrived in the village and […] [to our surprise] everyone came out to see us bringing the bear.' (Serebrennikov 1960: 122)

According to Serebrennikov (1960: 124), as well as Kel′makov and Hän-nikäinen (2008: 269), both remote pasts may also have a present reference point, the speech moment, rather than a past reference time. In (6), a use of the first remote past with a present perfect meaning is demonstrated.

(6)  Туж кемалась кылӥ мон со сярысь. Кураськись **вераз вал** мыным.

Tuž     kemalaś  kịl-i            mon  so   śarịś.
very    long.ago  hear-PST1.1SG   I    it   about

Kuraśkiś   vera-z         val        mịnịm.
beggar     tell-PST1.3SG  be.PST1    me.DAT

'I heard of it long ago. A beggar has told me.' (Serebrennikov 1960: 124)

In (6), the action referred to in the remote past does not precede the actions referred to in the first past. The actions bear results in the speech moment, and in English, the perfect would be used, as the result of the actions in the present are emphasized: the speaker is aware of what is being discussed, as they have heard it from someone before. If S and R can be simultaneous (S, R), the formal presentation (E – S, R) resembles that of a perfect instead of a pluperfect. Thus, the remote past would not be dependent on a reference time given by a synthetic, non-remote past tense frame (first past or second past) but could be used independently. Operating independently of another past reference time also supports the choice of addressing the Udmurt remote pasts as remote pasts rather than pluperfects: they seem to have no requirement to relate their temporal location to another past reference time. As perfects tend to further grammaticalize to have a simple past meaning, the pluperfects seem to sometimes develop a more general remote past meaning (Bybee et al. 1994: 102). Whereas the pluperfect may refer to a close past situation, as long as it happened prior to another reference point in the past, the remote past is used to express a generally remoter location in time, as the form loses its requirement to relate its temporal location to the reference time given in the non-remote past tense (Comrie 1985: 68; Bybee et al. 1994: 102).

According to Uusikoski (2016: 99–107), there are several different remoteness distinction systems in the languages of the world besides the typical hodiernal interval (earlier today / later today). While some may be as specific as distinguishing between actions and events taking place this year or before this year, some languages have less restricted criteria

for the cutoff point between a non-remote and a remote past. Some languages make a remoteness distinction between a non-remote past tense, which can always be used, and a remote past tense, which is used when the speaker wants to emphasize a greater temporal distance. Uusikoski points out that in languages which make a remoteness distinction between a non-remote past and a remote past, the choice between these forms is highly subjective. Thus, the remoteness of the events that a remote past denotes in these cases is difficult to define in temporal units, as it depends on the speaker's subjective evaluation.

Dahl (1985: 144–149) points out that a pluperfect may also develop other secondary or extended uses. The contradictive or discontinued use of the Udmurt remote past mentioned by Zaguljaeva (1984) and Serebrennikov (1960) seems to relate the action to a later state of affairs. This raises the question of whether the functions of the form are connected with the encoding of epistemic values, which falls within the categories of mood and modality. The categories of mood, modality and tense, though separate, are often interdependent (Lyons 1995: 332). Modal connotations have been observed in both future and past tenses (Lyons 1977: 809–816). Aikhenvald (2004: 7) refers to Matthews (1997: 228) in her definition of modality as being connected with the degree of certainty of what is being said, and mood, on the other hand, acting on the same semantic dimension but at the level of speech act. Spronck (2012: 103) summarizes a popular view on how to distinguish between mood and modality: mood operates at the level of utterances, whereas modality functions at the level of states of affairs (Dik 1997; Van Valin & LaPolla 1997). Spronck sees the category of mood as a grammatical expression of illocution, which is an upper category for questions, commands and suggestions. As the modal use of the Udmurt remote past rather relates the action to states of affairs than attenuates the tone of a speech act, the focus of this article is on modality, not mood. The distinction between these two categories is, however, not entirely without debate, and in some cases – especially when the remote past acquires a frustrative reading – the use of the form also alters the tone of the utterance.

One of the common secondary uses of the pluperfect, according to Dahl (1985: 146), is counterfactual, which is demonstrated through an English example in (7), where the pluperfect is used modally to express a past event that never actually took place.

(7)    *If JFK had not been assassinated, he would obviously have been re-elected.*
       (Patard 2019: 178)

The tendency of past tense forms to acquire modal meanings has been explained through a distancing effect that the use of a past tense creates: from a temporal aspect, this is distancing the events from speech moment or the reference point, and from a modal aspect, it is distancing events from factuality (Iatridou 2000: 244; Palmer 2001: 203; de Haan 2010: 461). The use of morphological past tense forms to encode modal meanings is a common phenomenon across languages, and when past tense forms are used modally, they may lose their specific past time reference (Iatridou 2000: 244). Counterfactual modality, however, excludes the reference event from the reality, as shown in (7) (Patard 2019: 177–178).

Examples of false or divergent belief, or actions performed under such beliefs, encoded through verbal inflection can be found in languages which use modal forms called frustratives (Evans 2006). The frustrative denotes an action which did not end in the desired result (Spronck 2012: 103–104; see also Dixon 2000: 293). Spronck describes the frustrative as a category expressing a double referential relationship between two moments containing discordant intentions and results: at the first moment, a discourse entity has an intention and at the second moment, this intention has not been fulfilled. In his grammar of Russian, Timberlake (2004: 397–398) describes a form with a function very similar to the frustratives described above. In this form, a temporal-modal particle *bylo* ('was') is combined with the past tense form of the main verb to compose a form with the function of a reversal of fortune, as shown in (8).

(8)    Он **пошёл было** прогуляться, но передумал.

       *On   pošël    bylo      proguljat'sja,   no    peredumal.*
       he    go.PST   be.PST    walk.INF         but   change.mind.PST
       'He was going to go out carousing but changed his mind later on.'
       (Timberlake 2004: 398)

The form in (8) expresses a preceding action in comparison to the other, as a remote past would, and the form resembles a remote past structure. Nevertheless, the construction implies that the preceding action achieved no results. In Russian, a tense with the aforementioned past-tense form of the verb 'to be' no longer exists, and the meaning of the form is modal. Old

Russian, on the other hand, used pluperfect forms consisting of a past form of the verb 'be' and a past participle[6] of the main verb (Goeringer 1995). Goeringer (1995: 324) claims that Old Russian pluperfects performed a future counterfactual meaning, where the actions or events are not counterfactual at their event time, but the counterfactuality arises in comparison with a later point of time. The contradictive or discontinued use of the Udmurt remote past noted by Zaguljaeva (1984) and Serebrennikov (1960: 121–124) seems very similar to the Old Russian future counterfactual (9).

(9)  Ӵукна валэн нуыны **косй вал** но, ӧз-а, мар-а, нуэ соос?

*Čukna      val-en      nu-ini      kos-i       val        no,*
morning    horse-INS   carry-INF   ask-PST1.1SG  be.PST1    but

*ẹ-z-a,        mar-a,     nu-e        soos?*
NEG.PST1-3-Q   what-Q    carry-CNG.PL   they

'I asked them to take it with the horse in the morning, didn't they do that?' (Zaguljaeva 1984: 51)

In (9), the remote past is used in the first predicate (*kosi val* 'I asked') to mark an unfulfilled request. The second predicate in the first past expresses the actual outcome (*ẹz-a nue soos* 'did you not take them'). It should be noted that while Zaguljaeva makes no remark on this in her study, she does translate the contrastive use to Russian by using a construction formed with the Russian particle *bylo*, accordingly to Timberlake's (2004: 397–398) example of the use of *bylo* in a corresponding context (8). A similar meaning can be detected in the example Kel'makov and Hännikäinen (2008: 269) give for the first remote past, as shown in (1) in Section 1. In addition to Russian, a corresponding form exists in Tatar, where a structure consisting of the non-evidential simple past with a non-evidential auxiliary 'be' denotes a non-realized or unfulfilled past (Šakirova 1953: 298; Poppe 1963: 104).

I have chosen to refer to this function as the future counterfactual function, as the description of a similar function of the Old Russian pluperfect fits the findings of the study best. The form may also be used to imply frustrated mental states, and the future counterfactual use is certainly in many ways similar to the use of frustrative modal verb forms (see Dixon 2000: 293, Spronck 2012: 103–104). I will take this into consideration in the

---

6.  The modern Russian finite past tense originates in the very same Old Russian *l*-participle (Laurent 1999: 37).

analysis regarding the emotional implications of the remote pasts. This meaning of the form is also close to a mistaken belief or an action performed under a false or divergent belief, which is noted by Evans (2006: 107) to be a common modal category in the languages of the world.

Lastly, Serebrennikov (1960: 124) mentions the use of the first remote past to anaphorically refer to something which has been discussed earlier by the participants (10). This function is not referred to in later studies and grammars.

(10)　Мон **верай вал** ини вань островме котыртэме потэм сярысь.

　　*Mon　vera-j　　　val　　ińi　　vań*
　　I　　say-PST1.1SG　be.PST1　already　whole

　　*ostrov-me　　　　kotịrt-em-e　　　　pot-em　　śariś.*
　　island-POSS.1SG.ACC　go.around-NMLZ-1POSS　want-NMLZ　about
　　'I already told you, I want to go around my whole island.'
　　(Serebrennikov 1960: 124)

In his study on multiple perspectives, Evans (2006: 108–111) discusses particles and verbal forms that relate the proposition or state of affairs to the congruence or divergence of knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. The anaphoric use of the first remote past in Udmurt as referring to a previously discussed topic seems to relate to this semantic field: it is used to mark shared knowledge. The matter will be further discussed in the analysis for both the first and the second past (Section 5.4.).

In Section 5.1., I will briefly discuss the relevance of aspect in defining the difference in the functions of the forms. I will mainly consider two hypernyms of viewpoint aspect, perfective (e.g. resultative) and imperfective (e.g. progressive, durative), leaning to the traditional definitions of Comrie (1976) and Smith (1997): perfective aspect is used to denote a complete event with a clear endpoint and could be considered as an undivided whole, being viewed from the outside of the situation, whereas imperfective action is seen as divisible, without an endpoint, being viewed inside the situation. The typical perfective situation relevant for the analysis is dynamic, whereas the typical imperfective situation is durative. Although justifiably criticized for being too vague and not giving parameters or tools specific enough for a thorough aspectual analysis (cf. Klein 1994, 1995; Borik 2006), the general definitions of Comrie and Smith will suffice to point out that aspect is not the category to distinguish between the first and the second remote past of Udmurt.

## 5. Analysis

The analysis is divided into sections for each of the functions described and defined above: the temporal, future counterfactual and anaphoric use, which I will analyze for both finite remote pasts taken into consideration in the study. Additionally, I will discuss mental states expressed through the first remote past as well as evidential and mirative functions connected with the second remote past. In Section 5.1 I will briefly discuss the relevance of aspect in the analysis, reflecting on notions from previous literature, mainly pointing out that aspect plays no significant role in differentiating between these two forms. I will wrap up the analysis with a short summary of the results of the study.

### 5.1. Evaluating the relevance of aspect

As stated in previous literature, the first remote past may refer to actions finished before or continuous until another reference time, either in the past or at the speech time; the actions may or may not bear results at the reference time (Serebrennikov 1960). In the earlier studies, including Zaguljaeva (1984), there is no specific reference to the aspectuality of the forms, and Serebrennikov's notions point to the direction of the forms being ambiguous in regard to aspect. Németh (2019) gives a similar conclusion in his study on the aspectuality of the forms: the first remote past is, according to him, neutral concerning an opposition between repetitiveness and a one-time event. As the use of the first remote past in denoting imperfective action (paying attention to the process, as described by earlier studies) is already demonstrated in Section 1 (1), I shall attest the perfective use of the first remote past in the following example (11).

(11)   Одйг кыл гинэ **верай вал**.

*Odig  kịl   gine   vera-j     val.*
one    word  only   say-PST1.1SG   be.PST1
'I had only said one word.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 9/8/2013)

In (11), the action referred to in the first remote past cannot be seen as imperfective: the situation is not a durative action nor does it pay attention to the process, but rather it is an undividable whole, a dynamic action with a

clear endpoint. Therefore, the first remote past may be used to express both perfective and imperfective actions.

According to Németh (2019), the second remote past may convey a one-time action or repetitive action. Contrary to what has been stated by Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen (2008), Winkler (2011) and Kozmács (2002), the second remote past may also denote an imperfective action as shown in (12), where a group of women fell victim to a pyramid scheme.

(12)    Уно аръёс ӵоже люкам коньдонзэс вакчи дыр куспын уноятыны **малпаллям вылэм,** нош асьсэос «штанитэк » кылиллям.

*Uno      ar-jos    čože    lʹuka-m          końdon-zes*
many    year-PL  during  gather-PTCP.PST  money-POSS.3PL.ACC

*vakči  dir  kusp-in        unojat-ini  malpa-lʹlʹam      vilem,*
short  time  distance-INE  grow-INF   think-PST2.3PL   val.PST2

*noš  aś-seos            "štańi-tek"  kil-ilʹlʹam.*
but  self-POSS.3PL  pants-ABS    stay-PST2.3PL

'They had been planning to increase, within a short time, the amount of money they had saved over many years, but they were left with nothing.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 11/8/2013)

In (12), the second remote past denotes a durative situation (*malpalʹlʹam vilem* 'they had been thinking'), which does not lead to results. A perfective interpretation is not possible: as the form is used in a future counterfactual function, it cannot be seen as paying attention to the result of the action or emphasizing the action as a whole. The action is not viewed from the outside but rather from the inside, as an irresultative process.

In line with the results of Németh (2019), there is no relevant aspectual difference between these two forms. When one reviews the earlier literature on the Udmurt remote past, it appears that the descriptions of the functions in the Russian literature set researchers on the wrong track. The remote past forms were described as expressing unfulfilled actions that were somehow interrupted by the following events, which is why the future counterfactual function has been referred to as *nesoveršennoe* [*dejstvie*], an incomplete action, which may be understood to refer to imperfective aspect (Serebrennikov 1963: 268). Additionally, the forms have been described as taking on present perfect readings, which is also characteristic for the Russian imperfective aspect (see e.g. Borik 2006). The imperfective

aspect has accordingly been used in the translations of the forms in such contexts. Nevertheless, as known from Serebrennikov's (1960) and Zaguljaeva's (1984) examples, combined with the data and new information in the present article, aspectuality does not determine the distinction between the two remote past forms presented in this study.

## 5.2. Temporal profile of the remote pasts

### 5.2.1. First remote past

The first remote past may be used for temporal ordering: it is used to express events and actions taking place prior to other events mentioned in the context (E – R – S, see Table 4 in Section 4). A temporal distance from either the reference time or speech time can be recognized in all occurrences. Temporal ordering is a typical function for a remote past. Other events, which define the reference point (R), are referred to in a simple past tense, and the event or action expressed in remote past has preceded the aforementioned actions and events (13). The first past is the past tense used when narrating the main storyline.

(13) Выпускнойлы мыным дӥськут басьтыны анай-атае ук-сёзэс ӧз быдтэ. Угось костюм но туфли **басьтӥ вал** туэ дышетскон ар кутсконын. Выпускнойлы чебер галстук гинэ басьтӥ – 250 манетэн.

*Vïpusknoj-lị̈   mị̈nị̈m   diśkut   baśt-ị̈nị̈*
graduation-DAT me.DAT clothes buy-INF

*anaj-ata-je          ukśo-zes          ẹ-z*
mother-father-POSS.1SG money-POSS.3SG.ACC NEG.PST1-3

*bị̈dt-e.      Ugoś   kosťum no   tufl´i   baśt-i      val*
spend-CNG.PL because suit  and  shoes buy-PST1.1SG be.PST1

*tue        dị̈šetskon ar   kutskon-ị̈n.   Vị̈pusknoj-lị̈*
this.year study     year beginning-INE graduation-DAT

*ćeber     galstuk gine  baśt-i –     250  mańet-en.*
beautiful scarf   only  buy-PST1.1SG 250  ruble-INS

'For my graduation, my parents didn't spend money to buy me clothes. For I had, indeed, bought a new suit and shoes at the beginning of this study year. For graduation I only bought a nice tie for 250 rubles.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 6/25/2013)

In (13), the reference time is given in the first predicate in the first past, which indicates the reference time to be earlier than the speech time (E – S). The second predicate is in the remote past, and the use of a remote past indicates that the event in question happened before the reference time (E – R).

The first remote past may also be used in the function of a general remote past without a past reference time (14). In these cases, the reference time may be the present. Therefore, instead of the prototypical pluperfect sequence E – R – S, the temporal structure is E – R, S.

(14)    Удмурт-а, уйгур-а, брангурт-а, бурят-а – ваньмыз дунне. Тод-
        мо венгер тодосчи Золтан Кодай **вераз вал**: фольклор – со кы-
        кетй анай кыл, крезьгуро анай кыл. Та малпан – туж шонер.

Udmurt-a, ujgur-a,    brangurt-a, burjat-a – vańmiz duńńe.
Udmurt-Q  Uyghur-Q  Brangurt-Q  Buryat-Q  all        world

Todmo       venger    todosći Zoltan Kodaj  vera-z
well.known  Hungarian scholar Zoltan Kodaly say-PST1.3SG

val:      folklor – so  kiketi  anaj    kil,     kreźguro
be.PST1  folklore  it   second  mother  tongue   melodic

anaj    kil.     Ta    malpan – tuž   šońer.
mother  tongue   that  thought  very  correct

'Udmurt, Uighur, Brangurtian, Buryat – we are all people [lit. the world]. The well-known Hungarian scholar Zoltán Kodaly has stated: folklore is the second mother tongue, a melodic mother tongue. This idea is very true.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/19/2013)

In (14), the speaker refers to a quote from a famous scholar sometime in the distant past. The copula is not used in present-tense predicative clauses in Udmurt – hence, the absence of a copula in this context should be interpreted as a present tense marker. As the form seems to have no requirement for a past reference frame, the temporal properties of the form should be viewed as those of a general remote past, as described by Bybee et al. (1994) and Uusikoski (2016).

## 5.2.2. Second remote past

From their temporal profile, the first and the second remote past correspond to each other. Typically, the second remote past is used to express actions or events completed or finished before the reference time given in the context (E – R – S), as in (15).

(15)   Со учыр бере ар ортчыса, ми ивор басьтймы – карт луо-
       нэ мынам Дальнёй Востокын, каторгаын кулэм. Отчы сое
       **месйллям вылэм** войнаын пленэ шедемез понна…

*So     učịr     bere   ar    ortčị-sa,   mi    ivor*
that    incident  after  year  pass-CVB   we    message

*baśt-i-mị –    kart      luon-e        mịnam*
receive-PST1-1PL  husband  becoming-1SG  me.GEN

*Dal'ńoj  Vostok-ịn,  katorga-ịn       kul-em.*
far       east-INE    forced.labour-INE  die-PST2.3SG

*Otčị      so-je    mes-il'l'am    vịlem     vojna-ịn*
there.ILL  he-ACC   put-PST2.3PL   be.PST2   war-INE

*pl'en-e        šed́-em-ez                 ponna …*
captivity-ILL   end.up-NMLZ-POSS.3SG      for

'A year after that incident we got a message – my future husband had died in the Far East, in forced labor. He had been sent there after being taken as a prisoner of war…' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/5/2013)

Example (15) also represents a prototypical use of the second past: the speaker first refers to an event, which she witnessed herself firsthand, in the first past (*ivor baśtimị* 'we received'), and the contents of the letter are referred to in the second past (*kart luone mịnam* […] *kulem* 'my future husband had died [according to what was told]'). The speaker then refers to what had happened before the man's death in the second remote past (*soje mesil'l'am vịlem* 'he had been taken'). The evidential second past denotes hearsay evidentiality as well as temporal ordering: the information referred to is found in the letter, not coming from the speaker.

The second remote past, much like the first remote past, may be used as a general remote past: the speaker does not give an exact time for when the event has taken place, and the time of the event must be assumed to have been in the relatively distant past (16).

(16)    Вавож ёросысь Гурезь-Пудга гуртын со Кузебай Гердлэсь
музейзэ кылдытйз, выльысь куштэм Эмезьгуртэз улӟытйз.
Та гуртэз куке но Кузебай Герд агай-вынъёсыныз ӵош
**пуктэм вылэм.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Vavož* | *joros-iś* | *Gureź-Pudga gurt-in* | *so* |
| Vavož | area-ELA | Gureź-Pudga village-INE | he |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Kuźebaj Gerd-leś* | *muzej-ze* | *kildit-i-z,* |
| Kuźebaj Gerd-ABL | museum-POSS.3SG.ACC | found-PST1-3SG |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *vil´-iś* | *kušt-em* | *Emeźgurt-ez* |
| new-ELA | abandon-PTCP.PST | Emeźgurt-ACC |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *ulǯit-i-z.* | *Ta* | *gurt-ez* | *kuke* | *no* |
| revive-PST1-3SG | this | house-ACC | sometime | PTCL |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Kuźebaj Gerd* | *agaj-vin-jos-in* | *čoš* |
| Kuźebaj Gerd | big.brother-little.brother-PL-INS | together |

| | |
|---|---|
| *pukt-em* | *vilem.* |
| build-PST2.3SG | be.PST2 |

'He founded the Kuzebaj Gerd museum in the village of Gureź-
Pudga of the Vavož region, revived the abandoned Emeźgurt.
Kuzebaj Gerd and his brothers had built that house sometime
[in the past].' (*Udmurt duńńe* 1/15/2013)

In (16), the speaker tells the story of the museum to Kuźebaj Gerd,[7] which
was opened in a house that Gerd and his brothers themselves built at some
point in a more distant past. The story is first told in the first past, which
is the default tense for reciting past events. At the end, the speaker adds
the notion of the house being built by Kuźebaj Gerd, and here he uses
the second remote past: in this case, the interpretation is that of hearsay
(marked by the use of the second past) and a general remoter past (marked
by the use of a remote past construction). In (16) however the reference
time is past, so the formal representation remains that of a typical pluper-
fect (E – R – S); the temporal adverb *kuke no* 'sometime', on the other hand,
would already by itself imply an earlier time frame and therefore, the use
of the remote past as a tool for temporal ordering is not motivated.

---

7.   Kuźebaj Gerd (1898–1937) was a well-known Udmurt author and cultural
figure.

As the temporal profile of the remote pasts suggests that these tenses are general remote pasts with no specific cutoff point nor a past reference frame, and the choice between a non-remote past and a remote past in these circumstances should be made on subjective grounds, it is of great interest to find out what these subjective criteria could be. In the following Sections 5.3. through 5.6., I will discuss the non-temporal factors that motivate the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past.

## 5.3. Future counterfactual

### 5.3.1. First remote past

A future counterfactual meaning is very prominent in the data. A future counterfactual relation between two events or states of affairs can be detected in three out of four first remote past occurrences. The future counterfactual use of the remote past denotes an unfulfilled action or intention, as the expectation of the addressee in the past of what was to come was false, and the implemented action does not align with the course of the events. Example (17) shows a typical case of the future counterfactual use of the remote past, and the use of the remote past here greatly resembles that of the Russian construction in (8).

(17)   Кирпич шуккон заводын кӧня ке ужамез бере, **бурдъяськиз вал** Ижевске яке Казане, но егит муртэ дышетскемез ӧвӧлэн нокытчы кутӥллямтэ.

*Kirpič̌   šukkon   zavod-ịn   kẹńa   ke*
brick   blow   factory-INE   how.many   PTCL

*uža-m-ez   bere   burdjaśk-i-z   val*
work-NMLZ-POSS.3SG   after   get.inspired-PST1-3SG   be.PST1

*Iževsk-e   jake Kazań-e,   no   jegit   murt-e*
Iževsk-ILL   or   Kazan-ILL   but   young   person-ACC

*dịšetsk-em-ez   ẹvẹl-en nokịtč̌ị   no   kut-il′l′amte.*
study-NMLZ-POSS.3SG   NEG-INS   nowhere   PTCL   take-PST2.3PL.NEG
'After working at a brick factory for a while, she was tempted to go to Iževsk or Kazan, but without education, this young person did not find a job.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/12/2013)

In (17), the young woman's intentions are brought up in the first remote past: *burdjaśkiz val* 'she was inspired', but the plan did not unfold in the

way she intended. The actual outcome – her not getting a job – is expressed in the second past (*noki̯tči̯ no kutilʹlʹamte* 'she was not taken anywhere'). The use of the first remote past here resembles the one presented in Example (1) by Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen, as presented in Section 1. In the future counterfactual context, the actual outcome is often given in a juxtaposed clause starting with the adversative conjunction *no/noš* 'but'.

In (17), the first action in the first remote past precedes the following action in the second past, and the temporal structure would therefore fit the profile of a remote past (E – R – S). Nevertheless, when I consulted Svetlana Edygarova on the motives behind choosing a remote past instead of a non-remote past in this context, she confirmed the observation that the use of a remote past signals a contrast between the event in the remote past and the followup to the story. According to Edygarova, the non-remote first past would be a more intuitive choice in the context if the outcome would align with the expectations, as shown in (18).

(18)  Кирпич шуккон заводын көня ке ужамез бере, **бурдъяськиз** Ижевске яке Казане, но егит мурт Ижевске мынйз.

*Kirpič̓ šukkon zavod-i̯n ke̯ńa ke*
brick blow factory-INE how.many PTCL

*uža-m-ez bere burdjaśk-i-z Iževsk-e jake*
work-NMLZ-POSS.3SG after get.inspired-PST1-3SG Iževsk-ILL or

*Kazań-e, no jegit murt Iževsk-e mi̯n-i-z.*
Kazan-ILL and young person Iževsk-ILL go-PST1-3SG

'After working at a brick factory for a while, she was tempted to go to Iževsk or Kazan, and the young person did go to Iževsk.' (Example produced by Svetlana Edygarova)

As Uusikoski (2016: 107) points out, in languages that use a general remote past with no specific cutoff point, the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past is always optional. This is the case with Udmurt, too: first past could be used instead of the first remote past in (17) even without modifications, as well as in any other example in the analysis. Nevertheless, the data and the native speaker's assessments suggest that the context in (17) is more suitable for accommodating a remote past.

The actual result may not always be included in the same sentence as the remote past. The outcome may also be expressed in the following sentence, as in (19).

(19)  Нош тужгес но сюлэмме вырӟытӥз Елена Вахрушевалэн
«Кионлэн пытьыез кузя» веросэз. Нырысь газетэз лисъяй но
**дэйми вал**, мар туж кузь веросэз сётӥллям шуыса. Нош лы-
дӟыны кутски но ӧй но шӧды, кызьы пумозяз вуи.

*Noš tužges no śulem-me viržit-i-z*
but most PTCL heart-POSS.1SG.ACC move-PST1-3SG

*Elena Vaχruševa-len "Kion-len piťi-jez kuźa"*
Elena Vakhruseva-GEN wolf-GEN mark-POSS.3SG along

*veros-ez. Ṇiṛiś gaźet-ez lisja-j no*
story-POSS.3SG first newspaper-ACC leaf-PST1-1SG and

*dejm-i val, mar tuž kuź veros-ez*
cringe-PST1.1SG be.PST1 what very long story-ACC

*śot-iľľam šuịsa. Noš lị ž-ịnị kutsk-i*
give-PST2.3PL COMP but read-INF start-PST1.1SG

*no ẹ-j no šẹdị, kịźị*
and NEG.PST1-1SG even realise.CNG how

*pum-oźa-z vu-i.*
end-TERM-POSS.3SG arrive-PST1.1SG

'But what moved my heart the most, was Elena Vakhrusheva's story
"In the Tracks of the Wolf". First I leafed through the newspaper
and cringed – what a long story they had published! But then I
started reading it and did not even notice how I finished it.' (*Udmurt
duńńe* 1/23/2013)

In (19), the speaker expresses her preliminary state of mind in the first re-
mote past (*dejmi val* 'I cringed'), seemingly reluctant to read a lengthy sto-
ry. The first remote past in (19) clearly denotes an action performed under
a false belief: the actual nature of the entity in question (the story), which
is contrary to what the reader first assumed, is expressed in the first past
(*lịdźịnị kutski no ẹj no šẹdị* 'I began to read and did not even notice'): in the
end, she enjoyed reading the story.

Sometimes, the actual outcome is not given in the immediate context,
but the remote past implies the course of events to differ from previous
aspirations (20). In the context, it is explained that a group of teachers went
on strike as the director of the school was almost removed from her post.

(20)  13-тй южтолэзе сютэм улонзэс дугдытӥзы, ёрос кивалтӥсьёсын огкылэ вуыса. Куинь толэзь талэсь азьло школалэн директорез Людмила Сомова соглаш **ӧз кариськы вал**, дышетскон юртэз автономной карыны. Соку дышетскон понна дун трослы бу-доз, шуиз.

| *13-ti* | *južtoleź-e* | *śutem* | *ulon-zes* | | *dugḍịt-i-zị,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| thirteenth | march-ILL | hungry | life-POSS.3PL.ACC | | stop-PST1-3PL |

| *joros* | *kivaltiś-jos-ịn* | *ogkịl-e* | *vuị-sa.* | *Kuiń* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| area | leader-PL-INS | agreement-ILL | arrive-CVB | three |

| *toleź* | *ta-leś* | *aźlo* | *škola-len* | *direktor-ez* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| month | that-ABL | before | school-GEN | director-POSS.3SG |

| *Ĺudmila* | *Somova* | *soglaš* | *ẹ-z* | *kariśkị* | *val,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ljudmila | Somova | agreeable | NEG.PST1-3 | make.CNG | be.PST1 |

| *dịšetskon* | *jurt-ez* | *avtonomnoj* | *kar-ịnị.* | *Soku* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| studying | house-ACC | private | make-INF | then |

| *dịšetskon* | *ponna* | *dun* | *tros-lị* | *bud-o-z,* | *šu-i-z.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| studying | for | price | much-DAT | grow-FUT-3SG | say-PST1-3SG |

'On the 13th of March they quit their hunger strike, reaching an agreement with the leaders of the area. Three months earlier the director of the school, Ljudmila Somova, had not agreed with making the school private. That would raise the price of studying too high, she said.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/14/2013)

In (20), the main storyline concerning the teachers' strike is told in the first past. A relevant fact about the situation is expressed in the first remote past (*soglaš ẹz kariśkị val* 'she had not agreed'). The action the predicate expresses has happened in an earlier time and could therefore also be temporally motivated (E – R – S). The larger context reveals that the school did become private in the end. In this context, as confirmed by Svetlana Edygarova, the first past would be a more intuitive choice if the situation had remained in the status quo, despite the event time being earlier than the main storyline. Example (20) also demonstrates the negative use of the first remote past: the form may well be negated, but the negation in itself does not imply a counterfactual nature between two events.

In a similar case (21) the contrastive use against a broader context is exemplified. In (21), however, the temporal structure is different from the previous examples: the first remote past and the first past are used within the same sentential unit to express simultaneous actions (E, R – S). In the context, the

daughter of the described person explains how she has to take care of her mother, who lives in a village in an area where there are no jobs. Going out of town to work is not an option (*transport ęvęl* 'there is no transport').

(21)  Нош уж öвöл. […] Нош палэнэ ужаны ветлыны транспорт öвöл. Колхоз вань дыръя со скал кыскисьын ужаз, **öз жожтйськы вал**.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Noš* | *už* | *ęvęl.* […] | *Noš* | *palen-e* | *uža-ny* | *vetl-ịnị* |
| but | work | EX.PRS.NEG | but | outside-ILL | work-INF | come-INF |

*transport*   *ęvęl.*      *Kolχoz*   *vań*   *dịr-ja*    *so*   *skal*
transport   EX.PRS.NEG   kolhoz   EX.PRS   time-ADV   she   cow

*kịskiś-ịn*     *uža-z,*        *ę-z*          *žožtiśkị*        *val.*
milker-INE   work-PST1.3SG   NEG.PST1-3   complain.CNG   be.PST1

'But there are no jobs. […] But there is no transport to take you to work outside the area. During the era of the kolkhoz, she worked as a cow milker, and she didn't complain.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/12/2013)

In (21), the person refers an earlier point in time in the first past (*skal kịskiśịn užaz* 'she worked as a cow milker') and then continues to claim that at that time she did not complain (*ęz žožtiśkị val*), which is expressed in the first remote past. In this case, the reference event of the remote past is contrasted with the present situation: now, she is unsatisfied, as there is no work and no chances of living a life on her own without an income. The action in the first past (*užaz* 'worked') is not contrasted with the present situation, but rather it describes a past reality where the contrasted action took place. The actions expressed in the first past and the remote past are simultaneous, and therefore it may be assumed that the use of the remote past in this context is not temporally motivated (E, R – S) – it marks future counterfactuality.

In the future counterfactual function, the remote past construction should be considered to carry a modal notion, where the speaker wants to emphasize a mental distance between the subject in the past and the subject at another (later) moment. The form is clearly also temporal, but as shown in (21), it does not always necessarily precede another past action but may be simultaneous with a past action expressed in a non-remote past. When this is considered together with the native speaker's assessment in (17), with the existence of a similar form with a corresponding function in the major contact languages Russian and Tatar, and with the high frequency of this meaning in the data, it is clear that the future counterfactual is a significant motivation behind the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past.

## 5.3.2. Second remote past

The second remote past may also be used to express future counterfactuality. The future counterfactual use of the second remote past is similar to that of the first remote past, the only difference being that the second remote past is, by default, also evidential. In the data, the second remote past occurrences were also often found to express events or actions which do not lead to the intended or expected results. A future counterfactual notion can be traced in one-third of the occurrences, which is less than with the first remote past, but still forms a significant part of the second remote past sample. The difference between the first and the second remote past lies in the encoding of evidentiality: the second remote past simultaneously signals a contradiction between two consecutive events, but the choice of the evidential past they use marks the information source to be someone other than the speaker. Such a case is presented in (22), where a future counterfactual meaning as well as a hearsay evidential meaning can be detected.

(22)  Соослы шутэтскон нунал сётэ вошъясьсы Эмма Орлова. Кык арня талэсь азьло гинэ коткуд скаллэсь 18 килограммлэсь ятыр йӧл **кыскиллям вылэм**, но тулыс матэктэмен, пудо сиёнэн шугъяськонъёссы кылдӥллям. Та вакытэ, пе, йӧлзы синэмын – 15,5 килограмм сяна кылыымтэ.

*Soos-lị    šutetskon  nunal  śot-e      vošjaś-sị̣*
they-DAT   resting    day    give-PRS.3SG  substitutor-POSS.3PL

*Emma Orlova. Kịk arńa  ta-leś  aźlo  gine kot́kud skal-leś*
Emma Orlova  two  weeks that-ABL before only every  cow-ABL

*18  kilogramm-leś jatịr  jẹl  kịsk-il′l′am    vịlem,  no*
18  kilogram-ABL  over  milk  draw-PST2.3PL  be.PST2  and

*tulịs    matekt-em-en,        pudo  śion-en   šugjaśkon-jos-sị̣*
spring  get.close-NMLZ-INS  cattle  fodder-INS  worry-PL-POSS.3PL

*kịld-il′l′am.     Ta    vakịt-e,   pe,   jẹl-zị̣*
emerge-PST2.3PL  this  time-ILL  QUOT  milk-POSS.3SG

*śin-emịn –   15,5  kilogramm  śana    kịl′ị̣-mte.*
deplete-RES  15.5  kilogram   except  remain-PST2.NEG

'They are given a day off by their substitutor Emma Orlova. Only two weeks earlier each cow gave over 18 kilograms of milk, but as the spring approaches, worries have arisen about feeding the cattle. At the moment, they say, their milk production has declined – they gave only 15.5 kilograms. (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/15/2013)

189

In (22), the speaker elaborates on the difficulties a farm is facing. The speaker then refers to what has been said by the interviewees to have been the earlier situation in the second remote past (*kiskil'l'am vilem* 'was milked'), but afterwards, the situation has taken a different course of events, which is expressed in the second past (*šugjaśkonjossi kildil'l'am* 'worries have emerged'). All the storytelling is marked in the second past or with the quotative particle *pe*,[8] thus the information is marked as hearsay. The future counterfactual use is parallel to that of the first remote past, the only difference being the information source marking.

In the following example (23), the future counterfactual meaning appears against a broader context.

(23)    Озьы ке но песятайме 1930-ти но 1933-ти аръёсы кулакъёс радэ поттылӥзы. Одӥг гинэ скалзэ талазы. Огполаз Сибире келян вылысь вить нылпиен валче дӧдые **пуктӥллям вылэм** ни. Вылазы дӥськутэн гинэ кельтӥллям. Но палазы пырыса, гурткалык кылзэ верам.

*Oźi        ke      no     peśataj-me                    1930-ti*
that.way    PTCL    PTCL   grandfather-POSS.1SG.ACC      1930th

*no    1933-ti ar-jos-i      kulak-jos rad-e    pottil-i-zi.    Odig*
and   1933rd  year-PL-ILL   kulak-PL  row-ILL  put-PST1-3PL   one

*gine skal-ze             tala-zi.     Ogpolaz Sibir-e     kel'an*
only  cow-POSS.3SG.ACC   take-PST1.3PL once    Siberia-ILL taking

*viliś  vit'  nilpi-jen    valče     ded'i-je    pukt-il'l'am vilem*
for    five  child-INS   together  sleigh-ILL  sit-PST2.3PL be.PST2

*ńi.     Vil-azi               diśkut-en    gine*
already  above-INE.POSS.3PL   clothes-INS  only

---

8. The particle *pe* is a quotative particle which marks the previous clause as originally being said by a third party (Bartens 2000: 321). The particle *pe* is a quotative index rich in function: it may convey reported and inferred meanings (Teptiuk 2019: 111–119). It may also function as a discourse marker with hedging function (Teptiuk 2019: 118). I found no remarks on the interaction or simultaneous use of *pe* and the second past, but the data reveals no combinations of *pe* and the second remote past. According to the descriptions of Bartens (2000) and Teptiuk (2019), the particle *pe* operates on a clausal level and marks the whole utterance as being stated by someone else, whereas the second past and the second remote past act on the level of the predicate.

| *keľt-iľ'l'am.* | *No* | *pal-azi̦* | | *pi̦ri̦-sa,* | *gurt* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| leave-PST2.3PL | but | side-ILL.POSS.3PL | | enter-CVB | village |

| *kali̦k* | *ki̦l-ze* | | *veram.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| people | word-POSS.3SG.ACC | | say-PST2.3SG |

'In spite of that, my grandfather was assigned to the ranks of kulaks between 1930–1933. They took the only cow. Once he was [reportedly] even put on a sleigh with five kids in order to be taken to Siberia. They only left them the clothes on their backs. But the village folk came to them and defended him.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/13/2013)

In (23), the speaker is telling the story of their grandfather, who was accused of being a kulak during the years 1930–1933 and treated accordingly. The beginning of the story is told in the first past (*peśatajme* […] *kulakjos rade potti̦lizi̦* 'they counted my grandfather as a kulak'). In the following sentence, the predicate is still in first past (*talazi̦* 'took'). The speaker then continues to refer what their grandfather has told them in the second remote past (*ded'i̦je puktiľ'l'am vi̦lem* 'he had been [according to the grandfather] put on a sleigh'). The remote past predicate is evidentially marked, and it represents the hearsay function. As the beginning of the story is marked in first past, the use of the second past in the followup marks the rest of the story as hearsay. The predicate in the remote past does not precede the previous event given in the first past. The use of the second remote past, however, signals that the story will not unfold towards the direction it seems to proceed towards. Svetlana Edygarova confirmed that the motivation behind the use of the remote past in this context is the future counterfactual nature of the event. In the last sentence of the story, it is pointed out that the village folk came to speak out against his being taken, and he was, in the end, not taken.

As Skribnik and Kehayov (2018: 543) point out, evidentiality cannot be negated in Udmurt, but evidentially marked actions can. The second remote past may also be negated. The negative forms were, however, extremely rare in the corpus. Even so, only three instances were found, each of them representing meanings typical of the second remote past (temporal, future counterfactual, mirative). A negative second remote past form with a future counterfactual meaning is presented below in (24).

(24) Со вакытъёсы семьяезлы секыт йӧтылӥз, соин но, лэся, песяй-
ме **лэзиллямтэ вылэм** школае мыныны. […] Песяе лушкемен
пуксем кошовкаяз но школае мынэм.

*So vaḳit-jos-i̠ śemja-jez-ḷi śeḳit j̠eṭil-i-z,*
DET time-PL-ILL family-POSS.3SG-DAT difficult get.into-PST1-3SG

*soin no, leśa, peśaj-me*
therefore also probably grandmother-POSS.1SG.ACC

*lez̠-il´l´amte ṿilem škola-je ṃin-iṇi.* […]
allow-PST2.NEG.3PL be.PST2 school-ILL go-INF

*Peśaj-e luškem-en pukś-em*
grandmother-POSS.1SG secret-INS sit.down-PST2

*košovka-jaz no škola-je ṃin-em.*
sleigh-ILL.POSS.3SG and school-ILL go-PST2.3SG

'During those times her family was facing difficulties, and that's
probably also why they didn't allow my grandmother to go to
school. […] My grandmother secretly got into a sleigh and went to
school.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 9/18/2012)

In (24), the speaker tells about her grandmother, who was not allowed to
go to school in her childhood due to difficult times the family was facing,
which is expressed in the second remote past (*lez̠il´l´amte ṿilem* 'they did
not allow'). Later on in the context, it is revealed in the second past that
in the end, she did secretly go to school, despite being told not to do so
(*pukśem* 'sat down', *ṃinem* 'went').

## 5.4. Anaphoric use in discourse

### 5.4.1. First remote past

Example (25) gives insight into how the first remote past may be used in
discourse to mark the given information as previously mentioned or dis-
cussed in the context. In the context, an interviewer is asking three young
women questions concerning their travels abroad. In the introductory sen-
tence, it is brought up that one of them has been on vacation in Egypt. The
interviewer starts the interview with the following question:

(25)  Ирина, тон лымшорын **шутэтскид вал** ини. Кыче пӧртэмлыкез
      Египет но Турция куспын?

*Irina,  ton  ḷimšor-ịn  šutetsk-i-d   val   ińi.*
Irina   you   south-INE  rest-PST1-2SG  be.PST1  already

*Ḳiče  peṛtemḷik-ez     Jegipet  no   Turcija  kuspịn?*
how   difference-POSS.3SG  Egypt   and  Turkey   between

'Irina, you have already been on vacation in the South. What are the
differences between Egypt and Turkey?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/26/2013)

In (25), there is no apparent temporal or future counterfactual motivation
to choose a remote past instead of a non-remote past: there is no past time
reference, the question begins with a declarative clause where the predicate
is in the first remote past. The remote past is, instead, used to imply that
the matter in question has been discussed earlier, and both participants
are familiar with the information. Svetlana Edygarova was consulted on
the interpretation, and she confirmed that the form here implies that this
information is shared between the participants: the interviewer confirms
an already-known fact, which was most likely already discussed earlier.
In this use, the use of the form indicates shared knowledge between the
participants of the discussion.

### 5.4.2. Second remote past

In a question, the second remote past may be used to mark information as
previously discussed, but as opposed to the first remote past, the second
remote past marks the addressee as the information source (26). In an in-
terview, a teacher is asked to tell about his career and his choice to become
a teacher.

(26)  Анай-атайды но **шуиллям вылэм** ик: воргоронлы дышетйсе
      мыноно шат?

*Anaj-ataj-dị          no   šu-il´l´am     vịlem    ik:*
mother-father-POSS.2PL  too  say-PST2.3PL  be.PST2  also

*vorgoron-lị  dịšetiś-e     mịn-ono  šat?*
man-DAT      teacher-ILL  go-NEC   SPEC

'Didn't your parents, too, say [according to what was told earlier],
that a man should not become a teacher?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 8/30/2013)

193

In (26), the interviewee told earlier during the interview of how his parents were opposed to his becoming a teacher, using the first past. Later in the interview, the interviewer returns to this comment by using the second remote past: they recite what the interviewee said before, only the tense changes (*Anaj-atajdị no šuilˊlˊam vịlem ik* 'didn't your parents say, too'). The form is evidentially marked, as it is based on information given by the interviewee. The motivation of the use of the second remote past in this context is to express that the interviewer is referring to something they have discussed earlier: the use can be compared to the use of the first remote past in (25). The choice of the first or the second remote past here lies in the encoding of evidentiality: according to Svetlana Edygarova, the use of the first remote past would be impossible here, as the information is only introduced during the interview, by the interviewee. When one compares the examples (25) and (26), the first remote past is used when the speaker confirms the information to be known and committed to by both participants, as they have either witnessed it or in some way commit to the truthfulness of the statement, whereas the second remote past shows a lower degree of commitment. As mentioned in Section 2, the Udmurt second past has been found to express a lower degree of commitment in previous studies (Kubitsch 2022). The use of the remote pasts in the contexts of (25) and (26) seems to be connected to encoding common ground, engagement, as well as divergence of knowledge of the speaker and the hearer, as discussed previously in Section 4.

## 5.5. Frustrated mental states implied with the first remote past

As future counterfactuality seems to relate to the frustratives described in Section 4, I have scanned the remote past occurrences for possible connections to frustrated mental states. In (27), the future counterfactual function is connected to a frustrated, even angry emotion. In the context, the speaker confronts a lover, at whom she is mad at, as he has spent the night with another woman.

(27)  Возьыттэм, мар дауртӥськод, тон монэ яратӥсько **шуид вал**
      ук?!

      *Voźiț-tem,  mar    daurt-iśko-d,  ton   mon-e*
      shame-CAR   what   do-PRS-2SG    you   me-ACC

      *jarat-iśko    šuiṣa   šu-i-d        val      uk!?*
      love-PRS.1SG  COMP   say-PST1-2SG  be.PST1  EMPH

      'It's shameless what you are doing, you said you loved me, didn't
      you?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 8/16/2013)

In (27), a frustrated reading may be due to the presence of *uk*, which is a
particle carrying a notion of common or shared knowledge and may be
interpreted as having an angry tone depending on the context. There is
no apparent temporal motivation for choosing a remote past instead of
a non-remote past: there is no given reference point or point in time that
the remote past clause would relate to. The motivation appears to be the
emphasized distancing notion of the remote past, which links the use to
the future counterfactual function: the speaker implies that her lover has
lied to her, or has changed his mind, and the speaker is not happy about it.

As the presence of *uk* in (27) cannot be ruled out as the source of an
emotional implication, Lukeriya Shikhova provided me with another
example where the use of the remote past can have an angry tone (28).
In (28a), the first past is used, and the tone remains neutral; in (28b), the
first remote past is used and it implies the speaker's frustration.

(28) a. Верай ни, но эшшо огпол верало.

      *Vera-j      ńi,       no   eššo   ogpol   vera-lo.*
      say-PST1.1SG  already  and   again  once    say-FUT.1SG
      'I said already, but I will say again.' (neutral tone)

   b. **Верай** ни **вал**, но эшшо огпол верало.

      *Vera-j      ńi      val,      no   eššo   ogpol   vera-lo*
      say-PST1.1SG  already  be.PST1  and   again  once    say-FUT.1SG
      'I said already, but I will say once more!' (dissatisfied tone) (Examples
      produced by Lukeriya Shikhova)

According to Lukeriya Shikhova, the dissatisfied implication in (28b) aris-
es from the form: the speaker wants to emphasize that what she is saying
has already been said, possibly a long time ago, and the recipient(s) should
have integrated the message, but it is implied that they have not. As the

possible frustrated implication is taken into consideration, one may notice that Zaguljaeva's example (9) (Section 4) has a very similar structure and clausal type to (27) and (28), and when I consulted Svetlana Edygarova on the matter, she confirmed that the use of the remote past form gives the utterance a dissatisfied undertone.

### 5.6. Evidentiality and mirativity in the second remote past

In (29), a future counterfactual relation is present, but instead of the false belief, the speaker uses the second remote past to express the actual course of events. In this example, the auxiliary *vilem* seems to act as a mirative marker instead of a remote past marker, which is in line with the results of Kubitsch (2022), who has previously noted *vilem* to mark mirativity without an intrinsic past reference.

(29)  Кылсярысь, Ласло Викар гожтэ, макем трос шошма удмуртъ-ёслэн вашкала дырысен воштйськытэк кылем, «измем, кын-мем» гуръёссы. Нош учконо ке, со удмурт зоутлэсь (гурлэсь) но сюан зоутлэсь пӧртэм вариантъёссэс гинэ **гожтэм вылэм**.

*Ḳiḷśariś,     Laslo Vikar  gožt-e,       makem   tros    šošma*
for.example  László Vikár  write-PRS.3SG  how.much  many    Šošma

*udmurt-jos-len  vaškala  dịr-ịśen  voštiśḳi-tek  ḳiḷ´-em,*
udmurt-PL-GEN  ancient  time-EGR  change-ABS  remain-PTCP.PST

*"izm-em,           ḳịnm-em"        gur-jos-sị.       Noš*
petrify-PTCP.PST  freeze-PTCP.PST  tune-PL-POSS.3PL  but

*ućk-ono  ke,   so   udmurt   zout-leś   (gur-leś)   no*
look-NEC  if    he   udmurt   song-ABL   tune-ABL    and

*śuan      zout-leś  pẹrtem     variant-jos-ses          gine*
wedding   song-ABL  different   version-PL-POSS.3SG.ACC   only

*gožt-em        vịlem.*
write-PST2.3SG  be.PST2

'For example, László Vikár writes how many of the old Šošma Udmurt tunes are[9] unchanged, "petrified, frozen". But when examined closer, he has [actually] only recorded different versions of Udmurt songs and wedding songs.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/15/2013)

---

9.  Here a possessive structure is used, and as Udmurt does not use the copula in a present-tense clause, the clause is lacking a finite verb (and thus a tense marker).

In (29), the remote past predicate (*pertem variantjosses gine gožtem vịlem* 'he has only recorded different versions') contradicts with what is previously stated in the present tense (*László Vikár gožte…* 'László Vikár writes'). The contrastive relation does not correlate to that which has been presented above: the old, false information is given in the present tense, whereas the actual state of affairs is expressed in the remote past (E – R, S). In (29), the use of the second remote past relates the clause to a prior expectation, which the use of the second remote past contradicts. This observation was confirmed by Svetlana Edygarova. In this case, the second past in the main verb of the remote past structure marks inferentiality, as when this is examined more closely, one may infer that the songs László Vikár has recorded were, in fact, just variants of a few songs. *Vịlem*, on the other hand, marks the information as unexpected and contrary to what the speaker believed to be true before, which gives the form a mirative meaning. In this context, instead of a future counterfactual, the form has a counterexpectational meaning.

The use of the second remote past in this context resembles that of a corresponding Tatar form (30). In this context, the main verb in the evidential past marks inferentiality, while the evidential auxiliary *ikän* ('was') implies that the message given is based on an assumption.

(30)  *Ej,  bezgä  qunaqlar  kil-gän            ikän!*
      oh   we.DAT  guest.3PL  come-PST.RES.INFER  ASSUM
      'Oh, guests have [apparently] come to us!' (Greed 2014: 79)

Evaluative meanings and time are closely linked. The relation can be seen between two event times as evaluation moments on a timeline, when one event is marked for a mistaken belief or actions under such beliefs (frustrative or future counterfactual) or mirativity (Spronck 2012: 103–104). As Spronck (2012: 103–104) links evaluative meaning with time, he mentions the category of mirative aside from the frustrative mentioned in Sections 4 and 5.5. In the mirative construction, the information in the mirative is marked as unexpected for the speaker. In this context, the use of the form could also be described as an unprepared mind, which is very similar to that of the frustrative meaning (Spronck 2012: 104). Nonetheless, the perspective profiles of the forms are different: while the frustrative takes into consideration the past agent's mental state in regard to the actual course of events, the mirative meaning highlights the agent's mental state at the revelation of the course of events.

In (29), it has to be taken into consideration that as the main verb and the auxiliary seem to convey two different meanings connected with evidentiality, the form may not be a temporal composition but a double-marked evidential for referential meaning (main verb in the second past) and mirative meaning (*vil̮em*). This could also be seen as evidential nesting, which is not an uncommon phenomenon in the languages of the world (Evans 2006: 102).

## 5.7. Summary

When comparing the first and the second remote past, the first thing to be noticed is that their temporal profile is very similar. It can be argued that the primary meaning of the forms is temporal: they represent general remote past forms with no specific past time reference. As all the other functions can be assumed to have arisen from the temporal meaning of the forms, they should be considered secondary, albeit pivotal functions when choosing to use a remote past instead of a non-remote past. Past tenses tend to develop modal meanings, and counterfactual modality has been considered a typical secondary function for pluperfects. In the Udmurt remote past, this manifests as future counterfactuality. Both forms may be used to express future counterfactual actions and events. Whereas the use of the first remote past may have frustrated or dissatisfied emotional implications, the second remote past may convey mirative meanings, and both forms thus participate in expressing mental states. Both forms may also be used anaphorically to refer to what has been previously discussed between the participants: in this case, the choice between the two forms is determined by the degree of commitment to the information. The frustrative use may arise pragmatically from the future counterfactual use, as the latter signals a disharmony between what has been said and done, or from the discourse-anaphoric use of referring to things discussed earlier, as the speaker wants to emphasize that the matter should be known to the participants.

All in all, as a temporal distance is present in all the occurrences, it can be assumed that the forms share a primary temporal nature. Nevertheless, as a future counterfactual meaning is present in most of the cases, the choice of a remote past over a non-remote past seems to be predominantly motivated by factors outside the scope of temporality. As Uusikoski (2016) points out, remote past is often chosen instead of a non-remote past on

highly subjective grounds, and the use of it is always optional. The semantic connection between a remote past and the future counterfactual use is clear: the reference event precedes the reference time, and there is a temporal distance between the two events. However, as a non-remote past could just as well be used, the remote past is favored instead of a non-remote past due to a mental distance between the subject at the event time and the subject at the reference time.

As the choice of the remote past is in general prone to be chosen based on subjective criteria, and past forms generally tend to acquire modal meanings, diachronic subjectification of the form from temporal to modal and pragmatic is a plausible explanation for the variance in the function of the forms.

## 6. Conclusions

The results of the analysis show that the finite remote pasts in Udmurt are rich in function and operate on multiple semantic domains. Contrary to what has been suggested in the recent Western grammars and textbooks, there is no aspectual difference between the forms: the predominant difference lies in encoding evidentiality. Temporally, their functions are in many ways similar to those of pluperfects: they are used to describe actions or events taking place earlier than other actions or events mentioned in the context. The forms can, however, also be used to express an indefinite, more generalized remote past, with no obligatory relation to another past reference time. Thus, the forms should not be addressed as pluperfects, but rather as general remote pasts which operate on a subjective level and could therefore always be expressed by means of simple pasts without a change in the temporal ordering of the utterance.

As the choice between a remote and a non-remote past is by default not restricted, the remote pasts seem to have developed meanings and functions that not only convey temporal meanings, but also carry a variety of modal and pragmatic notions. The most significant result of the study is the proposition that the first remote past is predominantly modal, as it is used to express future counterfactuality. Some of the older previous studies have noted this feature, but the function has not been properly described nor addressed in any of the studies, and it has been outright ignored in the recent grammars and textbooks.

Another important finding is the emotional use of the first remote past: the first remote past may be used to express conflicted feelings between a previously held belief of the state of affairs and the actual state of affairs. The use of the finite remote past forms in contexts of discourse (interviews, dialogues) and subjective positioning (sharing life stories and experiences) supports the connection to mental states as well as the discourse-anaphoric functions of the form.

In the data representing the second remote past, the most important findings are that the form may acquire similar modal meanings as the first remote past, although not as often. The main difference between the first and the second remote past is that the second remote past is evidentially marked and conveys evidential and related meanings. The opposition between the first and the second remote past in referring to what has been previously discussed associates the first remote past with a stronger first-handedness as it marks shared knowledge, and the use of *val* and *vil̮em* in analytic constructions in this function should be considered and analyzed in more detail in further studies.

## Non-standard abbreviations used in glosses

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PST1 | first past | EMPH | emphatic particle |
| PST2 | second past | EX | existential |
| ABS | absentive | ILL | illative |
| ADV | adverbial case | INE | inessive |
| ASSUM | assumptive particle | INFER | inferential |
| CAR | caritive | NEC | necessive |
| CNG | connegative | PTCL | particle |
| EGR | egressive | SPEC | speculative particle |
| ELA | elative | INFER | inferential |

## Primary data sources

Udmurt corpora: http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/

# References

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 435–485.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2015. Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 239–277.

BARTENS, RAIJA. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 238). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

BORIK, OLGA. 2006. *Aspect and reference time* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 13). Oxford: University Press.

BRADLEY, JEREMY & KLUMPP, GERSON & METSLANG, HELLE. 2022. TAM and evidentials. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 904–935. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BYBEE, JOAN & PERKINS, REVERE & PAGLIUCA, WILLIAM. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

COMRIE, BERNARD. 1976. *Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COMRIE, BERNARD. 1985. *Tense* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics 17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DAHL, ÖSTEN. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

DE HAAN, FERDINAND. 2010. Typology of tense, aspect, and modality systems. In Song, J. J. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*, 445–464. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DELANCEY, SCOTT. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33–52.

DIK, SIMON C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 2: Complex and derived constructions*. Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

EDYGAROVA, SVETLANA. 2022. Udmurt. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 507–522. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EVANS, NICHOLAS. 2006. View with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. In Cover, Rebecca T. & Kim, Yuni (eds.), *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 93–120. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

GIVÓN, TALMY. 2001. *Syntax: an introduction, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GOERINGER, KEITH. 1995. The motivation of pluperfect auxiliary tense in the Primary Chronicle. *Russian Linguistics* 19(3). 31–332.

GREED, TEIJA. 2014. The expression of knowledge in Tatar. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), *The grammar of knowledge: A cross-linguistic typology*, 69–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HONTI, LÁSZLÓ. 2000. Die zusammengesetzten Vergangenheitstempora in den mit Turksprachen kontaktierenden finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen. In Luutonen, Jorma (ed.), *Volgan alueen kielikontaktit: Symposiumi Turussa 16.–18.8.2001* (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielititeteen laitoksen julkaisuja 70), 29–34. Turku: Åbo Akademis Tryckeri.

IATRIDOU, SABINE. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(2). 231–270.

KELʹMAKOV, VALENTIN & HÄNNIKÄINEN, SARA. 2008. *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia* (Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen 14). Second edition. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

KLEIN, WOLFGANG. 1994. *Time in language* (Germanic linguistics). London: Routledge.

KLEIN, WOLFGANG. 1995. A time-relational analysis on Russian aspect. *Language* 71(4). 669–695

KOZMÁCS, ISTVÁN. 2002. *Udmurt nyelvkönyv*. Szeged: JATE Press.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2019. Az evidencialitás és az első személy kapcsolata az udmurt nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 115. 85–108.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2020. A létige múlt idejű alakjai mint modális partikulák az udmurt nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 116. 97–137.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2021. Past tense forms of the verb 'be' in modal constructions in Udmurt. *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований* (Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies) 15(4). 599–618.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2022. The semantic profile of the evidential past in Udmurt. In Baranzini, Laura & de Saussure, Louis (eds.), *Aspects of tenses, modality and evidentiality*, 262–287. Leiden: Brill.

LAURENT, RICHARD. 1999. *Past participles from Latin to Romance* (University of California Publications in Linguistics 133). Berkeley: University of California Press.

LEINONEN, MARJA & VILKUNA, MARIA. 2000. Past tenses in Permic languages. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 495–514. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LINDSTEDT, JOUKO. 2000. The perfect. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 365–383. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LYONS, JOHN. 1977. *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LYONS, JOHN. 1995. *Linguistic semantics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MATTHEWS, PETER 1997. *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NASIBULLIN = Насибуллин, Р. Ш. 1984. О некоторых аналитических формах глагола в удмуртском языке. *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 38–44. Ижевск.

NÉMETH, ZOLTÁN. 2019. A functional analysis of the analytic past tenses of the Udmurt language. *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследовании* (Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies) 13(3). 520–527.

PALMER, FRANK ROBERT. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PATARD, ADELINE. 2019. To the roots of fake tense and 'counterfactuality'. In Patard, Adeline & Peltola, Rea & Roussel, Emmanuelle (eds.), *Cross-linguistic perspectives on the semantics of grammatical aspect*, 176–212. Leiden: Brill.

PETERSON, TYLER. 2010. Examining the mirative and nonliteral uses of evidentials. In Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials* (University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics), 129–159. Vancouver: UBCWPL and PNWLL Press.

POPPE, NICHOLAS. 1963. *Tatar manual* (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 25). The Hague: Mouton & co.

REICHENBACH, HANS. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: The Macmillan company.

ŠAKIROVA = Шакирова, Г. Ф. 1953. Особенности говора татар Красно-октябрьского района Горьковской Области. *Академику В. А. Гордлэвскому к его 70-летию*, 292–301. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

SEREBRENNIKOV = Серебренников, Б. А. 1960. *Категории времени и вида в финно-угорскикх языках пермской и волжской групп*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

SEREBRENNIKOV = Серебренников, Б. А. 1963. *Историческая морфология пермских языков*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

SIEGL, FLORIAN. 2004. The 2nd past in the Permic languages. University of Tartu. (Master's thesis.)

SKRIBNIK, ELENA & KEHAYOV, PETAR. 2018. Evidentials in Uralic languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 525–553. Oxford: University Press.

SMITH, CARLOTA. 1997. *The parameter of aspect* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 43). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

SPRONCK, STEF. 2012. Minds divided: Speaker attitudes in quotatives. In Buchstaller, Isabelle & Van Alphen, Ingrid (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 71–116. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

TARAKANOV = Тараканов, И. В. 2011. Каронкыл. In Тимерханова, Н. Н. (ed.) *Удмурт кыллэн вераськонлюкеттодосэз (морфологиез)*, 138–254. Ижевск: Удмурт университет Издательтсво.

TEPTIUK, DENYS. 2019. *Quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric (Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian)* (Dissertationes Philologiae Uralicae Universitatis Tartuensis 21). Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 2004. *A reference grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UUSIKOSKI, RISTO. 2016. *Concepts of tense*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Modern languages, University of Helsinki.)

VAN VALIN, ROBERT & LAPOLLA, RANDY. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WINKLER, EBERHARD 2011. *Udmurtische grammatik* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

ZAGULJAEVA = Загуляева, Б. Ш. 1984. Сложные формы давнопрощедшего времени в некоторых удмуртских диалектах. *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 45–58. Ижевск.

# Perspectives on Hungarian and Uralic prehistory

Klima, László & Türk, Attila (eds.). 2021. *Párhuzamos történetek: Interdiszciplináris őstörténeti konferencia a PPKE Régészettudományi Intézetének szervezésében. Budapest, 2020. november 11–13. / Parallel stories: Interdisciplinary conference on Hungarian prehistory, organized by the Institute for Archaeology, PPCU, Budapest, 11–13 November 2020.* Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensia 23 & Magyar Őstörténeti Kutatócsoport Kiadványok 2. Budapest. 245 pp.

## 1. General overview

The collection *Páhuzamos történetek: Interdiszciplináris őstörténeti konferencia a PPKE Régészettudományi Intézetének szervezésében. Budapest, 2020. november 11–13.* is an interesting new addition to the long tradition of works dealing with the early history of the Hungarians and the Hungarian language. The book represents the proceedings of a conference organized by the Institute of Archaeology at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University (Budapest, Hungary) in 2020 and it is edited by two well-known experts in archaeology and the early history of the Hungarians: László Klima (the former chair of the Finno-Ugric Department at the ELTE University, Budapest, currently a researcher in the Department of Hungarian prehistoric archaeology at the Pazmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest) and Attila Türk (active in both the Prehistory of the Hungarian People Research Group of RCH, Budapest, and the Institute of Archaeology at the Pazmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest). The book is published in the series Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensia and also as the second part of the series Magyar Őstörténeti Kutatócsoport Kiadványok devoted to the prehistory of the Hungarians.

The volume consists of eleven articles. The first half of the articles have been written by linguists, and they deal with both methodological issues and more specific questions of Hungarian and Uralic historical linguistics; some articles deal with the history of Mordvin, Mari and Permic, so the scope

of the book is larger than simply Hungarian prehistory, contrary to what is implied by the English title. The other half of the book has been contributed mostly by archaeologists and concentrates on various issues of both Hungarian and Uralic archaeology. The last article stands out with its topic and methodology, investigating the background of a Hungarian myth and its impacts on prehistory.

The topics are connected to relevant questions and debates of historical linguistics and archaeology, and most articles have an interdisciplinary approach. The book is thus an interesting read for scholars of Uralic historical linguistics and for scholars of historical linguistics in general.

In general, *Párhuzamos történetek* is well edited and clear to read. The articles are accompanied by many maps and tables. All of the articles are written in Hungarian, but they include abstracts and lists of keywords in English (most articles) or Russian or German (one article each), and also the maps include English explanations, making the articles and their results somewhat accessible to international audiences, too. Here one should note that the English abstracts and explanations would have required a more careful proofreading, as there are various mistakes in spelling.

In the following, I will give a short overview of each article of the book and comment on some specific issues in more detail. I will focus mainly on the articles dealing with linguistics, but since the articles on archaeology have an interdisciplinary approach and are relevant to linguistics as well, I will also briefly comment on some problematic issues discussed in them.

## 2. Presentation and commentary of the articles

The first article of the volume is the methodological essay by Zsuzsa Salánki, Beatrix Oszkó and Mária Sipos titled "A kétnyelvűség helye és szerepe az alapnyelvi korban (The place and role of bilingualism in the era of proto-languages)". The paper discusses interesting issues of prehistoric multilingualism, especially possible multilingualism during Proto-Uralic times, a topic that is important but challenging. This is one of the most intriguing articles in the book.

The article offers a good and clear methodological overview: both the methods and basic sources of research on bilingualism as well as those of research on protolanguages and the comparative method are presented. Overall, the use of recent references of historical linguistics and sociolinguistics in the

article is impressive: even though in the beginning of the article the authors state that they will mostly refer to research written in Hungarian, many recent international works on Uralic prehistory are referred to (such as various publications by Aikio, Kallio, Laakso and Parpola).

Even though the article is very thorough and well-written, some minor shortcomings can be noted. It would have been good to refer to the article by Kallio (2006) that discusses fundamental issues related to the dating of Proto-Uralic: the authors mention that the Uralic protolanguage would have dispersed in the 4th millennium BCE at the latest, but later datings have been supported in recent research, especially in Finland (for example, Parpola's 2012 article that the authors refer to, supports Kallio's shallow dating of Proto-Uralic), and it would have been good to mention the possibly more recent date of Proto-Uralic, even if this issue can be debated. Also, Sammallahti (1988) could have been mentioned alongside the UEW as a source of Uralic etymology, especially as Sammallahti's reconstructions have played a big role in loanword research.

As a general note it would have been interesting to read more on the contacts of the speakers of Proto-Uralic, as this topic is important when the possible bilingualism of the speakers of Proto-Uralic is discussed. Even though the article describes different contact situations and gives a thorough look at the methodology of the research on bilingualism, the article does not offer ready answers to whether speakers of Proto-Uralic or later protolanguages were indeed bilingual, and what kind of role bilingualism played in the various contact situations (such as Baltic loanwords in Finnic).

The article is followed by Sándor Csúcs's treatise on Hungarian–Permic contacts "A másodlagos permi–magyar nyelvi érintkezések kérdése (Über die sekundäre Kontakte zwischen den permischen Sprachen und dem Ungarischen)". This is a topic that has a long research history and has been also discussed by Csúcs in several earlier publications. The present article is, in fact, largely a repetition of his earlier remarks published in 2007. An addition to the 2007 material is, however, the inclusion of the Ob-Ugric languages into the comparison of possible common innovations in phonology, morphology and syntax. Csúcs states that he added Ob-Ugric–Hungarian parallels in order to have a point of comparison to the possible Hungarian–Permic parallels.

The scrutiny by Csúcs includes some good remarks and observations, but unfortunately the material is not entirely up-to-date. There are problems especially with the lexical material. In his treatment of possible Permic loanwords in Hungarian, Csúcs does not distinguish the cognate sets that could formally go back to Proto-Uralic from etymologies that clearly cannot be regular cognates. The etymological analysis remains on a surface level and many phonological details (substitution patterns) are not treated comprehensively. The lexical material is taken from the UEW, and references are missing to recent works (such as WOT) that deal with the same etymologies and sometimes offer competing explanations.

I will here focus on some of the etymologies discussed by Csúcs and only briefly comment on some of the other issues:

Csúcs presents three probable loanwords from Permic into Hungarian, along with a longer list of potential loans. The three probable loanwords are, according to Csúcs, Hungarian *ezüst* 'silver' ← Early Proto-Permic ("korai protopermi", in Csúcs's terminology) *äz-veśkз* id., Hungarian *kenyér* 'bread' ← Early Proto-Permic *keŋer* or *keŋir* 'pearl barley, groat' and *küszöb* 'threshold' ← Early

Proto-Permic *kɔsip* id. Regarding the potential loanwords, the criteria for borrowing are not very clear, and it would have been better if the author had listed more arguments to support the idea that these words are indeed loanwords from Permic into Hungarian. For example, the word family involving Hungarian *lebëg*, *libëg* 'float', *levegő* 'air', reconstructed as *lempз* 'schweben, fliegen' in the UEW, is a possible loan from Permic according to Csúcs. However, there are irregularities within Permic (Udmurt *lobi̯-*, Komi *leb-*), meaning that the Proto-Permic reconstruction is not clear, and it is also unclear what the original vowel in Hungarian is. In this case it is very difficult to prove a loan from Permic into Hungarian, as we do not know enough of the history of the Hungarian and Permic words. Metsäranta (2020) assumes that the Permic words reflect Proto-Uralic *limpä-* 'fly', but the Hungarian vocalism (the open *e* in the standard language and *i* in some dialects) does not fit this reconstruction regularly (from Proto-Uralic *i* one would expect *ë* in Hungarian regularly, cf. *pintV-* > *fëd* 'cover'). It can be stated that before a Permic origin for Hungarian *libëg*, *lebëg*, etc. can be assumed, several issues need to be settled.

Another problematic example is the comparison of Hungarian *nagy*

'big' with Komi *naž* 'geizig', *nać* 'ganz, ganz und gar'. Csúcs gives a reconstruction with *\*l-* (Proto-Finno-Ugric *\*lðńćȝ*), but this is erroneous (a typo?), as there is no trace of *\*l* anywhere in the daughter languages. UEW reconstructs *\*nðńćȝ* 'stark, hart'. The irregularities within the Komi dialects (*ć* vs. *ž*) make it unclear how old the word is, and it is dubious whether this has anything to do with Hungarian *nagy* 'big'. It should be noted that the word *nagy* has also an alternative etymology presented by Widmer (2007: 302–304) which should have been addressed somehow in this context (even if Widmer's idea of deriving *nagy* from a Uralic stem *\*nu-* 'upper part' is not very convincing).

For Hungarian *imád* 'pray', a borrowing from Proto-Permic *vɔmiž* is possible according to Csúcs, but also competing loan etymologies have been suggested: the possible Turkic etymology (? West-Old Turkic *\*vïm-*, reconstructed on the basis of East Old Turkic *um-* 'ask for, covet') is discussed as a possible but uncertain etymology in WOT (455–457), and Harmatta (1997: 74) has assumed an Iranian origin (hypothetical Iranian *\*wi-mand-*, unattested but assumed by Harmatta on the basis of the alleged Indo-Iranian root *mand-* 'recite a liturgical text'; this is listed among the implausible Iranian etymologies by WOT: 1339, and in fact it is not quite clear what is the evidence for this Indo-Iranian root, as one does not find a Sanskrit or Avestan root reflecting *\*mand-* in EWAia or AiWb). Even if these etymologies have their problems, these should be addressed before a loan from Permic could be suggested.

It can be stated that many of the examples listed by Csúcs involve problems and it is dubious whether they can be loans from Permic into Hungarian or vice versa. However, this does not mean that it would be futile to assume such contacts and that there would be no promising examples at all. But it is in any case clear that the grounds are much shakier than Csúcs lets us assume, and the issue of early Permic–Hungarian contacts is far from settled. Also the three loanwords that Csúcs considers convincing might require a closer critical scrutiny.

Csúcs also discusses some other possible common phonological, morphological or syntactical innovations shared by Hungarian and Permic, for example the infinitive suffix *-ni*, voicing of word-initial stops, loss of the Uralic genitive case and development of new genitive markers, loss of Proto-Uralic past tense marker *\*ś* and the tendency to change the inherited SOV word order towards SVO. Here it is

important to note that Fejes (2020) has shown that many of the parallels suggested by Csúcs (2007) most likely do not result from contact: some are parallel developments, and some typological similarities are inherited from Proto-Uralic. Fejes accepts only the voicing of stops and the infinitive suffix *-ni* as possible evidence of contacts; see the table in Fejes (2020: 91).

To comment on some issues, the emergence of voiced stops in Hungarian and Permic, for example, is probably not a shared phenomenon: Csúcs is right in doubting common innovation here, and it seems overtly optimistic (see also Fejes 2020: 80) to assume that even the beginning of these phenomena had something in common. In the inherited Uralic vocabulary in Hungarian the voiced stops are rare, and the processes leading to the emergence of the stops seem to be very different from those in Permic, where voiced stops frequently appear in inherited words. In Hungarian, voiced stops are found mostly in loans and words of unclear origin, and very few plausible examples are found in inherited vocabulary. Regarding loans, WOT is uncertain as to whether the reconstructed West Old Turkic had word-initial voiced *\*d* and *\*g* or not, meaning that the emergence of Hungarian voiced stops in the

Turkic loans is not sufficiently well understood at present – see the discussion in WOT: 1077–1080.

In addition to cases where Hungarian and Permic show developments that are similar even if they are not necessarily connected (such as the voicing of initial stops), Csúcs also discusses some cases where the arguments for Permic influence remain quite unclear. The origin of the voiced *d* in the Hungarian 2SG verbal ending and possessive suffix is one such case. The origin of the voiced *d* is unclear, but it seems to be a long shot to assume Permic influence on voicing here. It is known that clusters of a nasal and *\*t* were present in various forms of the 2SG possessive suffixes in Proto-Uralic (see Janhunen 1982: 32; Salminen 1996: 25), and it would not be implausible at all to assume that the ACC.2SG *\*-mtə*, GEN.2SG *\*-ntə* that would regularly give *d* in Hungarian would have been generalized into the nominative as well (if the reflex of *\*t* was lost in the nominative, *d < \*-mtV* in the accusative could have been generalized). According to Kulonen (2001: 160–161), the *-n-* element would have denoted plurality in possessive suffixes and Hungarian 2SG *d- < \*nt-* would be generalized from plural forms.

Regarding the origin of the Hungarian accusative *-t*, different solutions have been suggested.

Honti (2022) does not mention this case suffix among the reflexes of the Uralic *-tV ablative. The -t accusative has occasionally been reconstructed even for Proto-Uralic (Honti 1996: 68; Sipőcz 2006: 29), but this has been disputed by Salminen (1996: 26).

The article by Csúcs is followed by several articles discussing contacts between Turkic and Uralic languages from various points of view. Gábor Zaicz writes on the Mordvin–Turkic contacts in "A mordvin nyelv kapcsolatai a volgai area török nyelveivel (The relations of the Mordvin language with the Turkic languages of the Volga area)", stating that he is basing his study mostly on earlier publications. The author dealt with this topic already in his unpublished dissertation in 1970, and he has published a study with a similar name in three parts in *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* in the years 2017–2019 (the latter opus is noted to serve as the predecessor and also as the source of the present work). The article indeed gives an impression of a summary or overview of earlier works, with few references and little argumentation, and although it does give a good overall picture of the topic, it would have made it easier for the reader if the author had presented more actual arguments to back up his claims.

Some particularly problematic issues include the lack of argumentation and donor forms when Iranian loanwords are discussed. A more thorough discussion of Iranian loanwords would have been especially interesting, as the Iranian influences in Mordvin have not received much attention in recent research, compared to many other branches of the Uralic family.

The discussion of Turkic loanwords is also not very thorough. For example, the main criteria in differentiating between the loans from Chuvash and the earlier varieties of Bulgar Turkic remain uncertain. There is no detailed discussion of sound substitution and the example etymologies are not analyzed in detail. Some references relevant to Turkic–Mordvin contacts are also missing that clearly should have been mentioned, such as Rogačev et al. (2013). Nor does Zaicz refer to Róna-Tas's (1988: 765–768) discussion of Turkic influences in Mordvin.

Klára Agyagási tackles the complicated topic of Mari–Turkic relations in her article "A mari nyelv kapcsolatai a volgai area török nyelveivel (Контакты марийского языка с тюркскими языками Поволжского ареала)". A well-known researcher on the topic, Agyagási has written extensively on this issue, most recently

in her 2019 monograph *Chuvash historical phonetics*. It is known that Mari historical phonology has made some important steps in the last few years (Aikio 2014; Metsäranta 2020), and some of the ideas presented earlier by Gábor Bereczki (1992; 1994) regarding Proto-Mari reconstruction have been disputed in these recent works. Agyagási largely follows Bereczki's views, and as she bases her chronology of Mari–Turkic lexical contacts on developments in Mari (and Turkic) historical phonology, it is natural that the acceptance of her ideas depends on the correctness of the reconstructed phoneme systems and their phonological developments. A critical review of Agyagási's (2019) ideas of Mari vocalism and the stratigraphy of Mari–Chuvash contacts has been recently presented by Holopainen and Metsäranta (2020), and I will not repeat those observations here, but I simply want to point out that not all of Agyagási's ideas are based on solid evidence. This means that even though Agyagási has some good ideas, her ideas regarding the stratigraphy of Turkic loans in Mari cannot be accepted as such. Nevertheless, I want to stress that even if one does not accept Agyagási's results as such, her present article is still an interesting contribution and worth reading

for all scholars of Mari and Chuvash – hopefully there will be more interaction between the different views on Mari vocalism in the future.

Agyagási is followed by Klára Sándor, who deals with methodological questions and problems with the donor languages of the early Turkic loans in Hungarian in "A török–magyar nyelvi kapcsolatok újraértelmezésének lehetőségei (The possibilities of reinterprating [sic] the Turkic–Hungarian language contacts". A specialist of both sociolinguistics and early Turkic languages, Sándor challenges many prevalent views (presented in major works like WOT) and offers a thought-provoking read that is among the most interesting ones in this book. Even if one does not agree with her, she shows clearly how problematic it is to determine the stratigraphy of prehistoric loanword layers, and what kind of a role sociolinguistic variation can play.

Sándor provides interesting and plausible arguments to doubt the stratigraphy of West Old Turkic loans, she even criticizes the very term. Sándor assumes that instead of several different chronological layers, the Turkic loanwords in Hungarian might reflect synchronic dialectal diversity in Turkic at the time of borrowing.

This is an interesting suggestion, and in principle possible, but unfortunately Sándor provides few concrete examples to back up the claims. To prove this, one should deal in more detail with all the cases where WOT (and earlier scholars) assume possible chronological differences, such as the substitution of the Turkic affricate *č (see WOT: 1088–1094 for a discussion of the different reflexes of this sound in the loanwords into Hungarian). One should also keep in mind that many details in Hungarian historical phonology still remain poorly understood, which makes it difficult to distinguish possible chronological differences in loanwords.

Hopefully the arguments presented by Sándor will provoke further discussion on the problematic and insufficiently understood aspects of early Hungarian–Turkic contacts. It is true that despite the conclusions of WOT being largely accepted by many researchers (such as Agyagási 2019; Bakró-Nagy 2021), the reconstruction of West Old Turkic has also received criticism (Erdal 2018). However, it should be noted that the other evidence for West Old Turkic – possible loans in Alanic/Ossetic and Slavic – should be taken into account, even if the material is scanty compared to the number of loans in Hungarian.

The editor László Klima in "A finnugor nyelvhasonlítás hazai története és egynémely őstörténeti csodabogarak. Zsirai Miklós (és mások) tévedései (A history of research on the linguistic relatedness of Hungarian and Finno-Ugric languages, with some odd ducks from the sea of linguists. Misconceptions by Miklós Zsirai and others)", one of his three (!) papers in the volume, deals with curiosities in the history of Uralic linguistics. Klima's account shows interesting examples of erroneous views that have circulated within Uralic linguistics for decades, when people do not pay attention to the original sources.

The last paper in the linguistics section is by the turkologist Balázs Sudár, who continues the interesting methodological discussion in his essay "A magyar nyelv honfoglalása (The Hungarian language conquest)". This methodological discussion is, alongside the contributions by Salánki et al. and Sándor, one of the articles in this book that can be most warmly recommended. The main problem presented by Sudár is how we can know when the Hungarian language really entered the Carpathian Basin, as the written sources do not really say anything about this, and the traditional explanations involve various problems: there is no

clear evidence of mass migration of Hungarians, and we know little of the demographics of the Carpathian Basin around the time of the alleged *Landnahme* of the Hungarians in the late 9th century (there is some evidence of a pre-conquest population remaining in parts of the Pannonian plain). Sudár compares different strategies of language replacement, and he notes that the Hungarian conquest does not really fit any of these. Future works on Hungarian ethnohistory and on the Hungarian conquest of the Carpathian Basin will have to address the questions raised by Sudár.

Sudár mentions that typological evidence for different kind of migrations would be useful, but this is complicated by the need to analyze every situation individually. It can be mentioned in this context that Janhunen's (2008) paper on the Turkic conquest and language replacement in Anatolia could probably be used as part of such an investigation, and the detailed treatise on the spread of Slavic by Lindstedt and Salmela (2020) would also be useful in such discussions.

The second part of the book consists of archaeology, history and folkloristics, and it consists of five articles, with an obituary to István Fodor ending the book. The first article "A finnugor alapnyelvi korszak a régészet tükrében (The Proto-Finno-Ugric (PFU) period in the Light of the Archaeological Research)" is by József Vígh. He presents findings of archaeology in careful detail, and his paper can be lauded for tackling some recent issues raised by Saarikivi and Lavento (2012). Nevertheless, it has to be said that it remains unclear to me how it is determined that the particular archaeological phenomena discussed by Vígh can be connected with Proto-Finno-Ugric in particular (not to speak of the difficulties in assuming this protolanguage at all). It should certainly have been stated that the Finno-Ugric node is not very widely accepted among linguists, especially outside of Hungary (see Aikio 2022: 3–4; Salminen 2002).

Another point of criticism is that references to some important sources on Uralic prehistory and homeland studies are lacking. There are no references to works of Parpola, who has discussed Finno-Ugric prehistory from the viewpoint of archaeology and linguistics in several works (such as Parpola 2012). Also Kallio's (2006) influential paper on dating and locating Proto-Uralic would have warranted a reference in such a work.

Vígh is followed by László Klima, who discusses archaeological traits of early Hungarians in

the Volga region in "Magyar nyomok a Volga-vidék régészetében (Hungarian traces in the archeology of the Volga Region)". Klima assumes that the similar archaeological items in the Volga region and Hungary are due to secondary contacts that took place already after the conquest; the Volga Bulgars were possible mediators.

The third article on archaeology, "A korai magyar történelem régészeti kutatásainak aktuális eredményei és azok lehetséges nyelvészeti vonatkozásai (Recent advances in archaeological research on early Hungarian history and their potential linguistic relevance)", is by the editor Attila Türk who presents new views on the Hungarians' migration route, challenging earlier views in sources like WOT. Regarding linguistic arguments, Türk moves in similar lines as Sándor, assuming that the early Turkic–Hungarian contact period was significantly shorter than has been traditionally assumed. Türk states clearly that this shorter period of contact would fit the recent results of archaeology better. However, as mentioned above in my comments on Sándor's article, many phonological details of the loanwords need to be settled before this kind of scenario can be accepted. On the other hand, Türk mentions a possibility that the earliest Turkic

loanwords could have been borrowed in Siberia already, and this is an interesting suggestion that could be pursued further.

László Klima's final piece in the book is titled "A magyar őstörténet hajnalán, Nyugat-Szibériában (At the dawn of Hungarian prehistory in Western Siberia)" and it deals with an earlier period than the paper by Türk. As is often the case with research on very early linguistic history, the author has claims that cannot be accepted as such. The article discusses interesting points of Ugric and Hungarian prehistory (also referring to possible sources from Antiquity that might depict the Ugric peoples), but much of the linguistic argumentation remains speculative. Klima makes use of the shared vocabulary of the Ugric languages, but it is disputable how secure this evidence is, as the Ugric vocabulary listed in sources like UEW involves numerous irregularities.

For example Klima mentions the shared Ugric horse vocabulary as evidence that the Proto-Ugric speakers were pastoralists, but much of the horse vocabulary is irregular: even the word for 'horse' (Hungarian *ló : lovat*, North Mansi *lo*, North Khanty *loγ*) displays irregular vocalism, and many other words related to horses, such as the word for

'saddle' (Hungarian *nyerëg*, East Mansi *naɣər*, East Khanty *nöɣər*) involve similar problems. In general, there are so many uncertainties regarding the history of Ugric that archaeologists should be extremely cautious.

Klima also discusses the problems of the dating of the split of Proto-Ugric; here a reference to Helimski (1982: 59–61) could be added. Iranian loanwords in the Ugric languages are not mentioned by Klima, although they can be potentially helpful in the chronology of Ugric linguistic history (see Korenchy 1972; Holopainen 2019: 339–343), but Klima does not comment on the loanwords in this context.

On the other hand, Klima assumes that the Ugrians learned horse-hunting from the Iranians in the Andronovo archaeological culture. Due to the problems with the reconstruction of the Ugric horse vocabulary mentioned above, this claim is problematic. In this context, it is interesting that Klima does not mention Harmatta's (1997) Iranian etymologies for the Ugric horse vocabulary. Iranian lexical influence would fit Klima's idea of the Iranian origin of Ugric horse hunting, but Harmatta's etymologies are not very convincing: for example, the assumed Iranian etymology for

Ugric 'horse' (Hungarian *ló* etc.) relies on Harmatta's "East Iranian" reconstruction *\*loɣə* (< Proto-Iranian *\*bāraka-*) 'horse' (Harmatta 1997: 72), which is not based on attested East Iranian evidence but is completely speculative. Klima does mention Napol'skikh's (2001: 371) Tocharian etymology for the Ugric 'horse': Napol'skikh assumes that this word is a loan from "Para-Tocharian" *\*lə̂wa-* 'Vieh' (< Proto-Tocharian *\*lŭwā*), but the assumption of "Para-Tocharian" is problematic as such, and the meaning of the attested Tocharian words (Tocharian A *lu*, B *luwo*) is 'animal/bird' according to Adams (2013: 606), making the semantic side of the etymology implausible.

I cannot judge Klima's conclusions on archaeology, but his article is in any case an interesting account of possible archaeological evidence on early Hungarian, and despite my critical remarks on some linguistic issues above, some of Klima's conclusions on the early spread of Ugric can be correct.

In the last article of the book, Somfai discusses a widespread motif among the "Altaic" and Uralic peoples in "A Fehérlófia mese mitológiai háttere (Mythological background of the Hungarian tale 'Whitemare's Son')", the only paper on folkloristics in the volume. Somfai assumes that the spread of

the similar motif was due to contact, but it remains unclear what the exact route of this motif to the Hungarians was.

The obituary to István Fodor is written by the two editors, both students of that renowned archaeologist who passed away in 2021. The obituary lists the scholar's important achievements but also goes quite deeply into personal issues, describing the problems in Professor Fodor's relationship with his two students.

## 3. Concluding remarks

As I hope to have shown above, the articles are of varying quality and depth. The most important studies are the ones by Salánki et al., Sándor and Sudár, as they tackle important methodological questions and provide new perspectives on older problems. It is difficult to comment on the book as a whole, as the articles included are quite different in both content and approach. As a general remark it can be stated that the book tackles some important problems of both Hungarian and Uralic prehistory, and though it does not present a synthesis of either, it presents discussions of individual topics. In this way the book can be recommended for scholars interested in Hungarian and Uralic historical linguistics, but it cannot be recommended as an up-to-date general guide to Uralic prehistory.

As Hungary has a lively tradition of prehistoric research, it is understandable to publish a volume of studies on the history of Hungarian written by Hungarian scholars. However, as this book includes studies on the history of other Uralic languages, too, it might have been a better option to invite also scholars from outside Hungary to contribute, especially as views on many central issues on Uralic prehistory differ across countries today. Perhaps a larger international symposium and publication on these topics would be a good next step. While we wait for this, scholars of Uralic studies outside of Hungary will certainly find thought-provoking material in many of the articles of this present book.

*Sampsa Holopainen*

*Fellowship holder of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (APART-GSK) at the Department of European and Comparative Literature and Language Studies of the University of Vienna*

# References

ADAMS, DOUGLAS Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B: Revised and greatly enlarged edition* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10). Leiden: Brill.

AGYAGÁSI, KLÁRA. 2019. *Chuvash historical phonetics: An areal linguistic study, With an appendix on the role of Proto-Mari in the history of Chuvash vocalism* (Turcologica 17). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

AIKIO, ANTE (LUOBBAL SÁMMOL SÁMMOL ÁNTE). 2014. On the reconstruction of Proto-Mari vocalism. *Journal of Language Relationship* 11. 125–157.

AIKIO, ANTE (LUOBBAL SÁMMOL SÁMMOL ÁNTE). 2022. Proto-Uralic. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 3–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

AiWb = BARTHOLOMAE, CHRISTIAN. 1961. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. 2., unveränderte Auflage. Berlin: De Gruyter.

BAKRÓ-NAGY, MARIANNE. 2021. A magyar nyelv finnugor és török összetevői történeti megvilágításban. *Magyar tudomány* 182. 108–118.

BERECZKI, GÁBOR. 1992. *Grundzüge des Tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte II* (Studia Uralo-Altaica 34). Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem.

BERECZKI, GÁBOR. 1994. *Grundzüge des Tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte I* (Studia Uralo-Altaica 35). Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem.

CSÚCS, SÁNDOR. 2007. Permi-magyar nyelvtörténeti párhuzamok. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 104. 86–123.

ERDAL, MARCEL. 2018. [Review of] Róna-Tas, András & Berta, Árpád †: *West Old Turkic: Turkic loanwords in Hungarian*. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 113(6). 510–513.

EWAia = MAYRHOFER, MANFRED. 1986–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen I–III*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.

FEJES, LÁSZLÓ. 2020. Utalhatnak-e a permi–magyar tipológiai párhuzamok areális kapcsolatokra? *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 116. 71–95.

HARMATTA, JÁNOS. 1997. Iráni nyelvek hatás az ősmagyarra. In Kovács, László & Veszprémy, László (eds.), *Honfoglalás és nyelvészet* (A honfoglalásról sok szemmel 3), 71–83. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.

HELIMSKI = Хелимский, Е. А. 1982. *Древнейшие венгерско-самодийские языковые параллели*. Москва: Наука.

HOLOPAINEN, SAMPSA. 2019. *Indo-Iranian borrowings in Uralic: Critical overview of the sound substitutions and distribution criterion*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-5729-4 (Doctoral dissertation.)

HOLOPAINEN, SAMPSA & METSÄRANTA, NIKLAS. 2020. A bridge too far – A Uralic perspective on Volga Bulgaria. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 65. 172–186. (A review of Agyagási 2019.)

HONTI, LÁSZLÓ. 1996. Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache. In Leskinen, Heikki & Seilenthal, Tõnu (eds.), *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Pars 1: Orationes plenariae et conspectus quinquennales*, 53–82. Jyväskylä.

Honti, László. 2022. Über die ugrischen Vertreter eines uralten uralischen Kasussuffixes. In Kaheinen, Kaisla & Leisiö, Larisa & Erkkilä, Riku & Qiu, Toivo E. H. (eds.), *Hämeenmaalta Jamalille: Kirja Tapani Salmiselle 07.04.2022. Тапани' ě"эмня падвы падар"*, 115–126. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto.

Janhunen, Juha. 1982. On the structure of Proto-Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 44. 23–42.

Janhunen, Juha. 2008. On the turkicization of Turkey in a Eurasian context. *Finnisch-ugrische Mitteilungen* 32/33. 139–150.

Kallio, Petri. 2006. Suomen kantakielten absoluuttista kronologiaa. *Virittäjä* 100. 2–25.

Korenchy, Éva. 1972. *Iranische Lehnwörter in den obugrischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kulonen, Ulla-Maija. 2001. Zum *n*-Element der zweiten Personen besonders im Obugrischen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 56. 151–174.

Lindstedt, Jouko & Salmela, Elina. 2020. In Klír, Tomáš & Boček, Vít & Jansens, Nicolas (eds.), *New perspectives on the Early Slavs and the rise of Slavic: Contact and migrations* (Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft 6), 275–300. Heidelberg: Winter.

Metsäranta, Niklas. 2020. *Periytyminen ja lainautuminen: Marin ja permiläisten kielten sanastontutkimusta*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-6870-2 (Doctoral dissertation.)

Napol'skikh, Vladimir. 2001. Tocharisch-uralische Berührungen: Sprache und Archäologie. In Carpelan, Christian & Parpola, Asko & Koskikallio, Petteri (eds.), *Early contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and archaeological considerations* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 242), 367–384. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Parpola, Asko. 2012. Formation of the Indo-European and Uralic (Finno-Ugric) language families in the light of archaeology. In Grünthal, Riho & Kallio, Petri (eds.), *A linguistic map of prehistoric Northern Europe* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 266), 119–184. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Róna-Tas, András. 1988. Turkic influence on the Uralic languages. In Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Uralic languages: Description, history and foreign influences* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1), 742–780. Leiden: Brill.

Rogačev & Bajazitova & Rinat = Рогачев, Владимир & Баязитова, Флера & Сафаров, Ринат. 2013. О мордовско-татарских контактах в Поволжье. *Linguistica Uralica* XLIX 2. 175–183. https://dx.doi.org/10.3176/lu.2013.3.02

Saarikivi, Janne & Lavento, Mika. 2012. Linguistics and archaeology: A critical view of an interdisciplinary approach with reference to the prehistory of Northern Scandinavia. In Saarikivi, Janne & Damm, Charlotte (eds.), *Networks, interaction and emerging identities in Fennoscandia and beyond* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 265), 177–216. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Salminen, Tapani. 1996. Comments on László Honti's paper "Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache". In Leskinen, Heikki & Seilenthal, Tõnu (eds.), *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Pars VIII*, 25–27. Jyväskylä.

Salminen, Tapani. 2002. Problems in the taxonomy of the Uralic languages in the light of modern comparative studies. In Agranat, Tatjana & Kazakevič, Olga (eds.), *Лингвистический беспредел: Сборник статей к 70-летию А. И. Кузнецовой*, 44–55. Москва: Издательство Московского университета.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1988. Historical phonology of the Uralic languages with special reference to Samoyed, Ugric and Permic. In Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Uralic languages: Description, history and foreign influences* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1), 478–554. Leiden: Brill.

Sipőcz, Katalin. 2006. A névszói esetragozás. In Kozmács, István & Sipőcz, Katalin (eds.), *Uralisztika: Uráli nyelvészet*, 22–32. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium.

UEW = Redei, Károly. 1988–1991. *Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I–II: Unter Mitarbeit von Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Sándor Csúcs, István Erdélyi †, László Honti, Éva Korenchy †, Éva K. Sal und Edit Vértes, Band III: Register Zusammengestellt von Attila Dobó und Éva Fancsaly. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Widmer, Anna. 2007. Morfológia, szófajváltás és etimológia. In Maticsák, Sándor & Jankovics, József & Nyerges, Judit (eds.), *Nyelv, nemzet, identitás: Az VI. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszus (Debrecen, 2006. augusztus 22–26.) nyelvészeti előadásai, II. kötet*, 301–312. Budapest & Debrecen: Nemzetközi Magyarságtudományi Társaság.

WOT = Róna-Tas, András & Berta, Árpád (with the assistance of Károly, László). 2011. *West Old Turkic: Turkic loanwords in Hungarian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

# Stretching deep into the past:
## an attempt to reconstruct macrofamilies of Northern Eurasia and North America

This book has very ambitious aims: it attempts to reconstruct two macrofamilies, both involving established language families in both Eurasia and the American continent. The authors are Edward Vajda, a specialist on the Yeniseian languages of Siberia and the Na-Dene languages of North America, and Michael Fortescue, an expert on the Eskaleut languages who has, over his long career, also dealt with other language families of Northern Eurasia, such as Chukotko-Kamchatkan. Of the hypotheses presented and advocated in this book, the first is the Uralo-Siberian hypothesis, discussed by Fortescue, which attempts to derive the Uralic, Yukaghir, and Eskaleut languages from a common source. The second is the Dene-Yeniseian hypothesis, discussed by Vajda, that argues for a genealogical connection between the Yeniseian and the Na-Dene families; the existence of the latter family itself has also been doubted in the past, as described in detail by Vajda in his part of the book. Both authors have argued in favor of these long-range relationships also in their earlier work.

The present work presents reconstructions of both Uralo-Siberian and Dene-Yeniseian lexicon, phonology, and morphology, and gives possible correlations from archaeology and genetics for the spread of these alleged language families across the Bering Strait from Eurasia to North America. The book consists of an introduction written by both authors, a part on Uralo-Siberian written by Fortescue, a part on Dene-Yeniseian written by Vajda, and a rather short concluding discussion written by both authors. It also includes appendixes of Uralo-Siberian and Dene-Yeniseian cognates; these etymologies are also discussed in the respective parts of the book. A reader familiar with other hypotheses on the alleged relationship of Uralic with other language families can also predict that this book, too, will have its problems. Indeed, it can be said that in spite of offering some

interesting new ideas, the conclusions of the book are not very convincing, at least regarding the deeper prehistory of the Uralic family.

This book *Mid-Holocene language connections between Asia and North America* deals with such large topics and so many different primary language families that it is difficult to make a detailed review of this work. It is also evident that no single scholar can master the history and reconstruction of all of the families discussed in the book. In this short review I will give a concise opinion on the book and analyze some of the main problems with it, especially regarding the Uralic reconstructions.

First of all, it is not necessarily the best idea to deal with these two hypotheses in one book, as even one of these long-range ideas would certainly be enough to fill one book. The authors address this already in the introduction, noting that the speakers of Eskaleut and Na-Dene languages in North America share DNA that results from migration across the Bering Strait some 5000 years ago, meaning that the arrival of these language families to North America might be connected. On the other hand, the authors mention in the introduction that the archaeological evidence connected with these prehistoric migrations involves problems, although the

migration of two distinct groups would be preferable to explain the arrival of these two distinct language families.

In any case, this lengthy book (more than 500 pages) now includes a huge amount of detail squeezed into a relatively small space. For example, Chapter 2 in Fortescue's part that presents the three language families involved in his hypothesis, is thirteen pages long. Since few scholars know Eskaleut, Yukaghir, and Uralic comprehensively, a longer presentation of all of these language families would have made sense. Of course, details of the reconstruction of these primary families are presented in the parts that deal with the reconstruction of specific aspects of Uralo-Siberian, but a longer presentation of the primary reconstructions would have been a friendly service to readers.

One thing that I felt is lacking in the book is a general discussion of the problems of long-range comparison. The authors occasionally refer to Campbell and Poser (2008), who discuss the methodological problems involved in these kinds of hypotheses, but in my view these methodological problems could have been addressed at greater length in the book. In spite of the fact that some hypotheses on a genealogical connection between established language families, like the

Indo-Uralic hypothesis, enjoy some popularity among serious scholars of historical linguistics, a rather widespread view (presented by works like Campbell 2004) is that going beyond the reconstructed stages of proto-languages is a risky endeavor that usually does not yield convincing results. In a work like the present book, the methodological problems – such as the credibility of the proto-language reconstructions that are used – could have been discussed in more detail.

On the other hand, the authors are aware of the dangers involved in their attempts, and both Vajda and Fortescue repeatedly note that they do not consider their hypotheses as proven, and that the present work is an attempt to show possible genealogical relationships but does not show clear evidence that Uralo-Siberian and Dene-Yeniseian proto-languages can be reconstructed. Also, when discussing the reconstructed lexicon of these macrofamilies, the authors often acknowledge the uncertainty of many etymologies and sometimes present counterarguments to their own etymological suggestions. In some cases, however, this cautious attitude is forgotten. Fortescue states in the summary of his chapter, for example, that "The situation of Afro-Asiatic, Sino-Tibetan, or indeed of Indo-European including Hittite may after all not be so different from that of Uralo-Siberian." This is a strange claim, as at least the Indo-European proto-language can be very well reconstructed involving evidence from Hittite (and the other Anatolian languages), while Fortescue's Uralo-Siberian reconstruction is, unfortunately, still quite far from that.

Regarding the use of Proto-Uralic data in the Uralo-Siberian reconstructions, several problems can be mentioned. The etymologies are taken from different sources, often from the works of Ante Aikio and Sammallahti (1988) but sometimes also from the UEW, which means that also poor etymologies are included in the discussion (such as Proto-Uralic *čäkV 'hard ice'). Also words with no clear Proto-Uralic status are sometimes used to represent the whole family. The role of Samoyed is particularly problematic in Fortescue's etymologies: the data from Proto-Uralic and Proto-Samoyed is listed separately in the comparisons, which is difficult to understand. Sometimes a Proto-Samoyed word that has a clear Uralic etymology is presented separately as a reflex of some Uralo-Siberian word. For example, Proto-Samoyed *pura- 'drill' is presented as a possible reflex of Proto-Uralo-Siberian *pura- 'go into', although it is in fact a reflex of Proto-Uralic *pura- 'drill'. Fortescue

also presents a Finno-Permic *pura- 'enter' as an uncertain cognate of this same word, also mentioning that "Samm[allahti] 1988 also has FU *peeri- 'go in'. Réd[ei] 1988 has (P)U *purV 'space behind'".

As a general and rather crucial note, it must be said that Fortescue, although he refers to Aikio's (2014) results on Uralic-Yukaghir lexical (loan) connections, does not seem to accept Aikio's convincing arguments on the non-relatedness of Uralic and Yukaghir. Fortescue mentions Aikio's criticism, but since this issue is very crucial for his hypothesis, a more detailed commentary on Aikio's ideas might have been in order.

Regarding the reconstruction of Uralo-Siberian historical phonology, the Proto-Uralic data is again not free from errors. Fortescue does refer to recent research, such as Aikio (2022), but he does not follow the standard, commonly accepted Proto-Uralic reconstructions completely. For example, he agrees with the criticism of Reshetnikov and Zhivlov (2011) on the reconstruction of Proto-Uralic *i̮, as reconstructing *a for many etymologies that require *i̮ fits his Uralo-Siberian hypothesis better. It would have been appropriate to refer also to Zhivlov's (2014) paper on Uralic vocalism where the reconstruction of Proto-Uralic *i̮ is clearly supported.

I hope these remarks on the Uralic data help to show that the book, unfortunately, involves similar problems as many other works that attempt to connect established language families and derive them from a more distant proto-language. Reconstructing beyond proto-languages is impossible if the reconstructed forms that are used involve problems or inconsistencies.

To end with some positive remarks, the book is clearly written and well-edited, and despite the problems with space mentioned above, it nevertheless offers a lot of detailed information on all the relevant families. The cautious approach of the authors also makes this work by Vajda and Fortescue a more interesting piece of reading than many other works dealing with similar hypotheses. Scholars interested in the problems of long-range comparison can read the book as an interesting, even if inconclusive, case study of hypotheses that attempt to reconstruct distant predecessors of established language families.

*Sampsa Holopainen*

*Fellowship holder of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (APART-GSK) at the Department of European and Comparative Literature and Language Studies of the University of Vienna*

# Bibliography

Aikio, Ante (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte). 2014. The Uralic-Yukaghiric lexical correspondences: Genetic inheritance, contact or chance resemblance? *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62. 7–76.

Aikio, Ante (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte). 2022. Proto-Uralic. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 3–27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Lyle. 2004. *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. Second edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Campbell, Lyle & Poser, William J. 2008. *Language classification: History and method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reshetnikov, Kirill & Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2011. Studies in Uralic vocalism II. *Journal of language relationship* 5. 96–109.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1988. Historical phonology of the Uralic languages with special reference to Samoyed, Ugric and Permic. In Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Uralic languages: Description, history and foreign influences* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1), 478–554. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

UEW = Rédei, Károly. 1988–1991. *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I–II: Unter Mitarbeit von Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Sándor Csúcs, István Erdélyi †, László Honti, Éva Korenchy †, Éva K. Sal und Edit Vértes; Band III: Register Zusammengestellt von Attila Dobó und Éva Fancsaly. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2014. Studies in Uralic vocalism III. *Journal of Language Relationship* 12. 113–148.

# Gert Sauer 1932–2021

Kurz vor Weihnachten, am 15. Dezember 2021, starb der bekannte Experte des Chantischen Gert Sauer nach kurzer Krankheit. Er wurde 1932 in Frankfurt an der Oder geboren und zog 1952 nach Berlin, wo er zunächst an der Humboldt-Universität Jura und dann Völkerkunde studierte, von denen aber keines ihn wirklich begeisterte. Bei einer der obligatorischen monatlichen Vorlesungen über Marxismus-Leninismus (‚Marxistisch-leninistische Weiterbildung‘ oder ‚Maleweibi‘ wie es damals im Volksmund hieß) traf er aber dann einige Studenten der Finnougristik (unter ihnen Rosemarie Radomski, Paul Kárpáti, Marianne Michl und Alexander Tinschmidt), die ihn fragten, ob er nicht stattdessen bei ihnen mal vorbeischauen wolle. So wechselte er bereits 1953 zur Sprachwissenschaft, insbesondere Finnougristik, die Wolfgang Steinitz damals unterrichtete. Mit Steinitz als Lehrer wählte Sauer für seine Diplomarbeit logischerweise ein Thema über das Chantische, die Sprache, der er sein Leben widmen würde. Die Diplomarbeit befasste sich dann mit der ostjakischen Nominalbildung; dieses Thema war so interessant und vielversprechend, dass Sauer 1956 als Aspirant seine Dissertation über dasselbe Thema zu schreiben begann, und bereits drei Jahre später konnte er sie erfolgreich verteidigen. Sie wurde einige Jahre später als Buch veröffentlicht (*Die Nominalbildung im Ostjakischen*, 1967); zu dieser Zeit gab es keine vergleichbare Arbeit für das Mansische, so dass Sauers Buch auch eine wertvolle Quelle für Informationen über den nahen Verwandten des Chantischen war.

Schon als Doktorand arbeitete Sauer auch an DEWOS, dem großen *Dialektologischen und etymologischen Wörterbuch der ostjakischen Sprache*, das von Steinitz begonnen wurde, und das Sauer praktisch sein ganzes Arbeitsleben lang begleiten sollte.[1] Sauers Hauptstelle war dann bei

---

1. DEWOS = Steinitz, Wolfgang. 1967–1993. *Dialektologisches und etymologisches Wörterbuch der ostjakischen Sprache*. Unter Mitarbeit von L. Böhnke, G. Sauer und B. Schulze (Lief. 1–3), Bearbeiter: G. Sauer unter Mitarbeit von L. Böhnke (= L. Hartung) und B. Schulze (Lief. 4–8), Bearbeiter: G. Sauer. Autoren der Artikel: L. Hartung, B. Schulze unter Mitarbeit von P. Hauel (Lief. 9–13). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

der Forschungsgruppe Finnougristik am damaligen Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR in Ost-Berlin (ab 1990 wieder Berlin) von 1959 bis 1996 (das Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft wurde später das außeruniversitäre Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft). Sauers Hauptaufgabe dort war die Herausgabe von DEWOS, und sein Name wird für immer auch mit DEWOS verbunden sein; Sauer arbeitete bereits an dem ersten Faszikel, der 1966 erschien, mit. Steinitz starb 1967, als der dritte Faszikel gerade im Druck war, und von 1970 an war Sauer der Bearbeiter aller Faszikel, unter Mitarbeit von Liselotte Böhnke (später Hartung) und Brigitte Schulze; Petra Hauel trat 1980 dem Autorenteam bei. Typisch für Sauers zurückhaltende Art ist, wie er seine eigene intensive Arbeit für DEWOS in den Hintergrund stellt; das Wörterbuch trug bis zuletzt Steinitzs Namen, aber Sauer war ab dem 4. Faszikel dafür verantwortlich, die verschiedenen Rohfassungen (in dem Maße, in dem sie existierten) verschiedener Autoren (u. a. Gerda Fröhlich, Gerhard Ganschow, Lieselotte Hartung, Rosemarie Radomski, Brigitte Schulze) zu einem kohärenten Ganzen zusammenzufügen; ab dem Buchstaben *k* wurden die etymologischen Notizen auch von Sauer geschrieben.

Eine weitere wichtige Arbeit, die wir Sauer zu verdanken haben, ist die Herausgabe (zusammen mit Renate Steinitz) der Steinitzschen *Ostjakologischen Arbeiten*, in vier dicken Bänden (1975–1989), die in den frühen 1970er Jahren begonnen wurde, als die Arbeiten an DEWOS noch liefen; hier war Sauer sowohl für die fachliche Gesamtbetreuung als auch für große Teile der Bearbeitung der Einzelbände zuständig. Diese Bände enthalten Neuauflagen von Texten, die 1939 in Tartu und 1941 in Stockholm unter dem Titel *Ostjakische Volksdichtung und Erzählungen aus zwei Dialekten* veröffentlicht wurden, aber bereichert um die Kommentare und Anmerkungen, die Steinitz in seinen Arbeitsexemplaren gemacht hatte, und andere, im Manuskript vorliegende, umfangreiche Texte und Kommentare (Bände I & II), und Bände mit bisher unveröffentlichtem und unübersetztem Material, nun auch mit deutschen Übersetzungen versehen (Band III), und eine Sammlung von bereits veröffentlichten, aber schwer auffindbaren Artikeln (Band IV). Aufmerksame Leser der Vorworte in den einzelnen Bänden werden den enormen Arbeitsaufwand erkennen (u. a. die Bearbeitung, das Entziffern äußerst schwer lesbarer Texte, Korrektur, Übersetzung), den Sauer geleistet hat, um die *Ostjakologischen Arbeiten* zu der unschätzbaren Quelle zu machen, die sie sind (eine Reihe von Texten, die Sauer und die anderen Mitglieder des Bearbeitergremiums aufgrund ihrer

Qualität nicht für bedeutend genug befunden hatten, in die *Ostjakologischen Arbeiten* aufgenommen zu werden, wurden später in der Reihe *Berliner Beiträge zur Hungarologie* veröffentlicht).

Sauer war in allen Aspekten des Chantischen zu Hause, hatte aber auch ein besonderes Interesse an der Phonologie und begann mit phonologischen Analysen der östlichen Chantisch-Varietäten als Vorarbeit für DEWOS während seiner Aspirantur. Er organisierte auch das Symposion ‚Phonologische Analyse der uralischen Sprachen‘, das vom 17. bis 20. September 1974 in Ost-Berlin stattfand; in dem Tagungsband hat er sowohl die (anonyme) Einleitung geschrieben als auch eine phonologische Analyse des Tremjugan-Dialekts veröffentlicht. Nach der Fertigstellung von DEWOS begannen die verbliebenen Mitglieder der ‚Berliner ostjakologischen Schule‘, die an DEWOS und den *Ostjakologischen Arbeiten* mitgearbeitet hatten, mit der Arbeit an den chantisch-russischen Kontakten. Ein Blick in Sauers Bibliographie (vgl. Helimski & Widmer 2002: xvii–xxii[2]) zeigt jedoch, dass seine Interessen breiter gefächert waren, da er auch über chantisch-komi und chantisch-selkupische lexikalische Kontakte publizierte; er war auch ein produktiver Rezensent und ein regelmäßiger Redner auf Konferenzen.

Nach Steinitzs Tod 1967 wurde das Fach Finnougristik an der Humboldt-Universität abgeschafft im Zuge der Hochschulreform von 1968, aber Vorlesungen mit finnougrischen Themen werden weiterhin an der Humboldt-Universität gehalten; Sauer selbst unterrichtete dort 30 Jahre lang, von 1966 bis zu seiner Pensionierung 1996, zahlreiche Fächer (Chantisch, Ungarisch, Einführungen in die Finnougristik).

Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag im Jahr 2002 wurde er mit einer Festschrift geehrt, die von Eugen Helimski und Anna Widmer herausgegeben wurde und 23 Artikel umfasst.

Mit Gerd Sauer verlässt uns einer der letzten ‚Berliner Ostjakologen‘; sein wissenschaftliches Erbe wird aber unentbehrlich bleiben für jeden, der sich mit dem Chantischen beschäftigt.

*Rogier Blokland*

---

2. Helimski, Eugen & Widmer, Anna. 2002. Zum Geleit. In Helimski, Eugen & Widmer, Anna (Hrsg.), *Wŭśa wŭśa – Sei gegrüßt! Beiträge zur Finnougristik zu Ehren von Gert Sauer dargebracht zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 57). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

# Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol, Samuli Aikio 1937–2022

The well-known expert and pioneer of Saami studies Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol, Samuli Aikio, left us on 31 August 2022 to join his wife and elder son on the other side.

Sámmol was born on 11 May 1937 in Ohcejohka (Utsjoki, Finland) in the northernmost part of Sápmi. He was the fourth of eleven children that his parents Luobbal Sámmol, Samuli and Karin Sofia Aikio (née Helander) were blessed with. The family lived a materially humble but culturally rich life that was based on customary Saami livelihoods. His father was widely known as a clever man, a skillful craftsman and excellent storyteller.

As it soon became obvious that the younger Sámmol was especially gifted, the idea of sending him off to higher education presented itself. At the age of 14 Sámmol moved to Helsinki for secondary, and later, higher education with economic support from the Society for the Promotion of Sami Culture (Lapin sivistysseura). Despite this unusual background, he graduated in 1957 as one of the best students in the Munkkivuoren yhteiskoulu. As Sámmol recounted, the idea to send him away for schooling was accepted by his father because Sámmol was sickly as a child and therefore seemed unlikely to become a tough worker. However, it is more probable that his father realized the true potential of his son and the possibilities of higher education.

In Sámmol's childhood it was not uncommon that children in Ohcejohka got only a few years of elementary education, regardless of the fact that six-year public schooling was in principle compulsory. To obtain secondary or higher education, one had to move far away from home. In addition, young people with higher education were not likely to get a job near home. This meant that a large part of the most talented young people moved away permanently. For Sámmol, as for many other contemporary Saami, higher education meant the beginning of an unwanted in-betweenness. On one hand, he was a Saami with a very traditional background and a strong connection to his people and home, but on the other hand, he was a member of the urban academic intelligentsia. Throughout his life he fought to bring these worlds together.

Sámmol ended up living in Helsinki for some twenty-five years. During high school and in the years that followed, he was not yet a passionate promoter of Saami issues but instead planned a completely different career.

He worked for instance as a journalist at the Finnish News Agency STT. However, he soon understood that there was so much to improve in the situation of the Saami, and so few educated Saami to drive these issues, that he decided to get involved in the Saami movement.

From the mid-1960s Sámmol was very active in the Saami political field, promoting Saami language and culture. Especially issues related to education and the status of the Saami language were close to his heart. During the 1960s and 1970s he was the secretary of the Helsinki-based Nordic Saami Council (Sámiráđđi) and the Society for the Promotion of Sami Culture, as well as chief editor of *Sabmelaš* (*Sápmelaš*), the only Saami-language magazine published in Finland at that time. As a Saami and a confident and knowledgeable speaker, he was a sought-after presenter and interviewee at various public events and in the media, a role that he took already as a high school graduate in 1957. He also participated in several official advisory boards that investigated the situation of the Saami people.

At the same time Sámmol worked as an assistant at the department of Finno-Ugrian ethnology at the University of Helsinki and continued his university studies of ethnology and Finno-Ugrian languages. He graduated in 1977 with a Bachelor of Arts. During his studies he actively collaborated with many well-known researchers. He worked especially closely with Professor Erkki Itkonen and with assistant and researcher, later professor, Pekka Sammallahti. All the classic figures in Saami studies, such as T. I. Itkonen, Karl Nickul, and Robert Crottet, were part of his network of contacts. Of his fellow Saami activists, he helped for instance Nils-Aslak Valkeapää with the new North Saami orthography used in Valkeapää's first collection of poems *Giđa ijat čuov'gadat* (1974).

During his time in Helsinki, Sámmol contributed to many significant publications in the field of Saami folklore, literature, and music studies. He edited several books, such as *Sabmelažžai maidnasak jâ muihtalusak – Lappalaisten satuja ja tarinoita* by Pedar Jalvi ('Saami Fairy Tales and Stories', 1966) and the award-winning anthology *Skabmatolak: Sabmelaš kirjjalašvuođa antologiija – Tulia kaamoksessa: Saamelaisen kirjallisuuden antologia* ('Fires in the Polar Night: An Anthology of Saami Literature', 1974) with Erkki Itkonen and Pekka Sammallahti. Another award-winning bilingual pair of books was *Girdinoaiddi bárdni: Sápmelaš máidnasat* and *Lentonoidan poika: Saamelaisia satuja* ('The Son of the Flying Witch: Saami Fairy Tales', 1978), a collection of traditional Saami

folklore selected from scientific material that he edited with his wife An-nukka. He also translated books, such as Johan Turi's classic *Kertomus saamelaisista* (1979, original 1910; this book has been published in English translation in 2012 as *An Account of the Sámi*).

Sámmol was also an active fieldworker who collected, for instance, place names, folklore, and traditional music in Sápmi, on his own and in cooperation with other researchers, especially in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, his contribution to the collections of the Names Archive at the Institute for the Languages of Finland (Kotus) is huge, with more than four thousand collected Saami place names from Ohcejohka and Aanaar (Inari).

In 1975 Sámmol was offered an opportunity to move back north: He started to work at the Sámi instituhtta (Nordic Sámi Institute), an all-Saami research institute in Guovdageaidnu (Kautokeino). At the Institute he began, with other Saami researchers, to develop the new field of Saami history that interpreted the events of the past based on Saami understanding and perspectives. He continued this groundbreaking work for the rest of his life and published several books and articles in the field. Probably the best known among them is *Olbmot ovdal min: Sámiid historjá 1700-logu rádjái* ('People Before Us: The History of the Saami until the 1700s', 1992).

In 1981 the Institute for the Languages of Finland founded a researcher's position for Saami language planning and consulting. This position was not filled until 1987 when Sámmol took it up, and it was based in Ohcejohka in accordance with his wish. He held the post until the turn of the year 2001–2002. During his years in this position, he made a significant contribution to the field of Saami language, helping ordinary and professional language users with questions concerning spelling, inflection, new and old terminology, and neologisms, as well as with demanding translations. He also participated in translating the Bible and worked with the National Land Survey of Finland (Maanmittauslaitos) when Saami place names were added on maps and new orthographies applied. One of his contributions most remembered by the public was his participation, year after year, as an expert on the national radio program *Mistä sanat tulevat – Gos sánit bohtet?* ('Where do words come from?'), where people could call in and ask about words and names.

As a scholar Sámmol represented a holistic view and saw the benefits of multidisciplinary approaches, including also artistic approaches. This was of course based on his own versatility and artistic abilities as a true

renaissance man. As a linguist, he is best known as an expert in the field of Saami onomastics. His writings on the history of Saami family name and personal name systems reveal a vast understanding that took decades of work to achieve. His last great contribution to Saami onomastics was the comprehensive book *Davvisámi báikenamat* ('The North Saami Place-names', 2017), which can be seen as his testament to younger researchers. However, Sámmol's love for nature and his excellent command of his mother tongue resulted also in wide collections of traditional Saami vocabulary dealing with names and terms connected to birds, plants, snow, weather, and salmon.

Sámmol's work reached the wider public and other researchers, and it was also noticed outside the Saami and academic communities. He was awarded the Order of the Lion of Finland on 6 December 1994, and in May 1998 he was awarded an honorary doctorate at the University of Oulu, where he had worked for a short period as an associate professor during the 1970s.

For younger colleagues Sámmol was always a very warm, compassionate, and supportive person who never judged anyone by their looks. Probably due to his own multifaceted personal history, he never seemed to make preliminary judgments based on person's background, ethnicity, or language. Instead, what really mattered for him was genuine passion for science and knowledge. He was always ready to help with difficult questions, but he never insisted on his opinions if they were felt unwanted. His humbleness in acknowledging his own (seldom made) mistakes was exceptional.

In his last years Sámmol suffered from serious illnesses, but the joy brought by his grandchildren who lived nearby always made his eyes sparkle with happiness. Sámmol was laid to rest in Ohcejohka on 25 September 2022. He is deeply missed by colleagues, friends, and relatives alike.

*Vuoiŋŋas dál ráfis, sophos.*

*Taarna Valtonen*

*Sananjalka* on vuodesta 1959 lähtien ilmestynyt laadukasta humanistista tutkimusta julkaiseva tieteellinen vuosikirja.

*Sananjalassa* julkaistaan vuosittain noin kaksitoista vertaisarvioitua artikkelia suomen ja sen sukukielten, kotimaisen kirjallisuuden, folkloristiikan, kansatieteen, uskontotieteen ja arkeologian alalta. Lisäksi vuosikirja tarjoaa luettavaksi kiinnostavia katsausartikkeleita ja arvosteluja tuoreista humanistista alaa koskettavista kirjoista.

*Sananjalkaa* julkaisee vuonna 1929 perustettu Suomen Kielen Seura.

# *Sananjalka*

Numerossa 64 muun muassa:

TANJA TOROPAINEN: Sananalkuisen *u*-äänteen merkinnän muuttuminen
     Mikael Agricolan teoksissa
RIKU ERKKILÄ ja NIKO PARTANEN: Mitä komin väyläsijoilla ilmaistaan?
RONI HERMO: Median porilaisrepresentaatiot porilaisuuden kuvaajina
ROOSA SUOMALAINEN: Ideaalilukijan jäljillä. Käsityksiä tekstinulkoisen lukijuuden
     ihanteista suomalaisessa lukemiskulttuurissa
NOORA VAAKANAINEN: Poissaolon kielelliset ja graafiset jäljet
     kahdessa kirjeromaanissa

Lisäksi uusimmassakin numerossa on runsaasti muita artikkeleita, katsauksia ja kirja-arvosteluja.

Tilaukset:         Silja-Maija Spets, sananjalka@utu.fi
Päätoimittaja:     Katri Priiki, sananjalka@utu.fi
Toimitussihteeri: Minerva Piha, sananjalka@utu.fi

# VIRITTÄJÄ

**V**anhin ja suurin suomenkielinen kielitieteellinen lehti

**A**jankohtaisia ja monipuolisia kirjoituksia suomen kielen ja sen sukukielten tutkimuksesta ja opetuksesta

**N**eljä numeroa vuodessa, yhteensä noin 630 sivua

**K**otisivuilla laaja hakemistotietokanta julkaistuista kirjoituksista

**K**irjaesittelyjä, katsauksia ja keskustelua

**A**ikaisempia vuosikertoja ja tuoreita lektioita verkkolehdessä

*https://journal.fi/virittaja*

*virittajablogi.kotikielenseura.fi*

**Virittäjässä vuonna 2022 julkaistua:**

- Vesa Koivisto  Karjalan jälkiä suomessa. Konsonanttiyhtymä *tsk* suomen murteissa (1/2022)
- Marjatta Palander & Jukka Mäkisalo  Reaaliaikatutkimus rajakarjalaisidiolektista (3/2022)
- Veera Hatakka  Värit tilanteissa. Predikatiivilause ja intransitiivilause muuttumattoman ja muuttuvan värin kuvauksessa (4/2022)
- Tapani Kelomäki  Martti Rapola ja Paavo Ravila fennistiikan ja fennougristiikan keskeisvaikuttajina (4/2022)

**Tilaushinnat 2023**

- Suomeen 82 € (Kotikielen Seuran jäsenille 79 €, opiskelijoille 33 €)
- Ulkomaille 82 € (Kotikielen Seuran jäsenille 79 €, opiskelijoille 39 €)
- Verkkolehden tilaus Kotikielen Seuran jäsenille 42 €, opiskelijoille 22 €